DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 848 HE 017 532

AUTHOR	Allen, G. Jack; Andrews, Grover J.
TITLE	The Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases. Final Report. Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 80
CONTRACT	N00204-79-C-0029
NOTE	170p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accrediting Agencies; Ancillary School Services; *Armed Forces; Case Studies; *College Instruction; College Programs; *Institutional Evaluation; *Military Personnel; *Off Campus Facilities; Position Papers; Postsecondary Education; *Program Administration; Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS	*Out of State Institutions; Site Visits

ABSTRACT

Results and recommendations of an in-depth study of education offered at 25 military installations are presented. Information is provided on study goals and the research design, and strengths/weaknesses of the study. A summary of site visitation findings is presented, along with conclusions concerning: institutional purpose and goals, organization and administration, admissions, curriculum, instruction and quality assurance, learning resources and physical facilities, student services, and financial resources. Findings targeted to the military, regional accrediting agencies, the states, and the Veterans Administration are included. Twenty-four recommendations pertaining to the major concerns identified during the case studies are offered, along with two recommendations that address the principle and philosophy of military-base education. Three major areas for further study are also identified, and a national policy for military base education is proposed. Appendices include instructions for the contents of institutional reports on off-campus, military-base educational programs; lists of participating bases and personnel; and a policy statement on military-base education for the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education's policy statement on military base education. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247848

HE 017 532

Final Report of The Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education On Military Bases

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

January 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

By G. Jack Allen and Grover J. Andrews

Prepared for the Office of the Secretary of Defense
Under Defense Activity for Nontraditional Education Support
Contract No. N00204-79-C-0029
To the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

THE COUNCIL ON POSTSECONDARY ACCREDITATION
THE COUNCIL ON POSTSECONDARY ACCREDITATION
THE COUNCIL ON POSTSECONDARY ACCREDITATION
THE COUNCIL ON POSTSECONDARY ACCREDITATION

CONTENTS

Foreword i

Preface iii

Part I: Introduction 1

Part II: The Self-Study Approach 13

Part III: Findings of the Study 27

Part IV: Conclusions and Recommendations 56

Part V: Proposed National Policy 78

References 85

Appendix 86

- A. Advisory Committee Members
- B. Prospectus
- C. Letters of Invitation with Enclosures
  - Part I: Participating Base Commanders
  - Part 2: Participating Institutions
  - Part 3: Visiting Committee Members
  - Part 4: Document to Educational Services representatives in the DOD
- D. Participating Military Bases and Institutions
  - Part 1: Military Bases
  - Part 2: Institutions
- E. Military Base Case Study On-Site Team Members
- F. Military Base Case Study On-Site Observers
- G. FRACHE Policy on Military Base Education

FOREWORD

Millions of Americans have acquired useful knowledge and skills of high quality during their service experience through education programs offered on military bases by civilian institutions. For many it is the only postsecondary education they have had. For others it provided the foundation for further education including the highest professional levels in medicine, law, and teaching, just to cite a few.

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation's case study of education offered on military installations has made an indepth study of 25 bases including all branches of the armed forces. The study involved 54 different evaluators, all professional educators drawn from postsecondary institutions throughout the United States. While the report tends to focus on the weaknesses found, there are also many strengths present in the on-base programs offered by civilian institutions. Indeed, there has not been enough said about the truly good educational programs and courses that have been offered on military bases over the past 30 years.

My own personal experience with military education began in 1942 while I was in the Army Air Force at Urbana, Illinois. I was impressed then, as I am today, with the quality of education that was being provided by our colleges and universities for service personnel, in many instances at great expense to the institution or, at best, with a minimum of monetary returns.

In 21 years as the chief executive officer of one of the regional accrediting commissions of higher education, I have been personally involved in the evaluation of education offered by accredited institutions for all of the military services. While I have seen most of the questionable practices identified by the current critics, instances of such practices are rather few in number and relatively insignificant to the whole.

This case study was designed to gather the facts concerning the strengths and weaknesses of military base education. This report presents a summary of these findings and the conclusions and recommendations based on them.

The evaluation process for education offered on military installations does not end here. Rather, this study is the beginning of a new and continuing evaluation process. It is my intent, and the intent of the study, to encourage and improve the good and to eliminate the bad, in order to assure that American service personnel receive quality educational programs provided by regionally accredited, postsecondary educational institutions.

Gordon W. Sweet
Chairman of the Advisory Committee

PREFACE

Until a few years ago, college-level instruction for service personnel offered on military bases was conducted by only a few institutions, and control and monitoring were relatively simple. It was easy to find out who was doing what, where, and for whom. During the seventies the number and variety of institutions involved in the on-base educational enterprise has increased significantly. Almost every kind of postsecondary educational institution is represented among the host of providers that offer an unlimited variety of courses and degree programs at all levels from certificate programs through the doctorate.

This rapid expansion of educational activity by postsecondary educational institutions and the increased number of military students enrolled in on-base programs and courses have triggered a great deal of concern about the operational procedures used and the quality of the programs offered. In response to the perceived problems and criticisms, the U. S. Department of Defense contracted with the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation to conduct a case study on off-campus postsecondary education on military bases. The case study was implemented with the cooperation of the six regional accrediting associations, all branches of the military service, and a representative number of the colleges and universities that offer programs and courses on military installations.

In achieving the purposes of the study, we were able to identify and place into proper perspective the issues and problems that have emanated from military-base education in recent years. The study has confirmed that these problems and issues do, indeed, exist. Based on the magnitude of the enterprise--numbers of institutions involved, programs offered, and students enrolled--and the dispersed nature of the operation, however, the proportion of poor programs and practices that exist in relation to the good and acceptable is probably no greater for off-campus activities than it is for on-campus operations. This conclusion in no way justifies the existence of questionable programs on military bases. There can be no rational or acceptable justification for poor-quality academic programs on base, or on campus. Thus, the recommendations contained in this report are designed, if implemented, to improve the quality of academic programs offered on military bases without diminishing access to an appropriate variety of programs for military personnel.

There are ambiguities sufficient to allow any one of the principal constituent partners in on-base education to point the quality finger at another and not see or admit its own shortcomings. If such happens, it will be unfortunate; yet, it often happens. The purpose of the case-study approach was not to single out parties for blame, but to identify and document the roles, relationships, and responsibilities of all in making the whole educational enterprise for military personnel academically acceptable and respectable. The military student deserves this, and all parties--the military, educational institutions, accrediting agencies, and the state and federal agencies involved--share in the responsibility.

Part I of the report traces the background for and development of the case study and presents the goals and objectives for the project. Part II presents information on the design of the study, how it was structured and organized, and identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the study.

Part III presents a summary of the findings from the various site visitations and draws general conclusions from these findings concerning institutional purpose and goals, organization and administration, admissions, curriculum, instruction and quality assurance, learning resources and physical facilities, student services, and financial resources. Specific findings related to the military, regional accrediting agencies, the states, and the Veterans Administration are also presented.

Part IV presents the conclusions and recommendations that have evolved from the case study as a whole. There are 24 recommendations made dealing with major problems and issues that have been identified as a result of the case study. There are two general recommendations that address the principle and philosophy of military-base education.

There are 11 specific recommendations concerned with the institutions that offer programs on military installations. Six recommendations are presented for action by the military, including the DOD and the various branches of service. Three recommendations address the concerns and responsibilities of regional accrediting associations, and one each is presented for the states and the Veterans Administration.

Part IV concludes by identifying three major areas for further study: (1) the case-study approach as a model for evaluation of military-base educational programs, (2) the development of a data system of essential quantitative factors concerning quality, and (3) continued study to determine if there is a need for special criteria and standards for military-base education.

Part V proposes a national policy statement to provide a conceptual base and consistency in operations in the provision of postsecondary educational programs for military personnel on military installations among the various parties responsible in the endeavor. A major finding of the case study was that there is no common foundation upon which a "program" of education for military personnel can be built. In the absence of such a conceptual framework for program development and implementation, poor practices, inferior quality, ineffective evalation, and unnecessary competition have emerged in the military-base educational enterprise.

The proposed policy presents a general concept of philosophy for military-base education and then provides a conceptual framework by identifying and defining the roles and responsibilities for the major parties involved--the institutions, the military, the accrediting agencies, the states, and the Veterans Administration. The case study has been successful in identifying the major roles to be performed by those involved in education offered on base. The true measure of success of the study will come when the parties involved take positive action to remedy the problems and resolve the issues that have been identified. The recommendations presented and the proposed national policy provide the framework for resolution.

We wish to acknowledge with appreciation the many individuals who have made major commitments of time, effort, and resources for the successful implementation of the case study. This would include specifically the presidents and their staff members who participated in the study and supplied complete information and documents on their institutions' military-base programs as a data base for the case study teams, the chairmen and team members who volunteered their time and effort to make the on-site evaluations, and the members of the advisory committee for the valuable service they rendered throughout the development and implementation of the study.

A special word of appreciation is due to Gordon W. Sweet, executive director of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, who not only served as chairman of the advisory committee, but also supported the project by providing staff, secretarial services, office space, and logistical services from the Commission. Thanks also go to Gerald Kauvar and Major Steve Sellman of the office of the assistant secretary of defense for their service on the advisory committee and help in arrangements for the visiting committees. Representatives of the services--Bob Quick, Air Force; Lt. Col. John Keenan, Marines; Tilton Davis, Army; and Frances Kelly, Navy--helped in many ways to facilitate the work of the project staff and the visiting committees.

Finally, we are grateful to the United States Department of Defense for providing the funds to the Council on Post-secondary Accreditation for the study. We are grateful to COPA and the DOD for the complete freedom and latitude given to us to conduct the study without interference in an atmosphere of professional objectivity.

Grover J. Andrews
G. Jack Allen

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Background

In February 1977 at the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation's (COPA) mid-year meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana, Colonel Robert S. Zimmer, director of Postsecondary Education for the United States Department of Defense (DOD) addressed the executive officers of the various accrediting agencies to discuss a critical concern of the DOD and the military in general over the quality of educational programs offered on military installations by civilian postsecondary institutions. Col. Zimmer's remarks placed responsibility on the accrediting community for the quality of education offered at military installations. However, it was the consensus of the group present that the responsibility for quality assurance is shared by a number of involved parties: the military--including the Department of Defense, the respective branches of the services, the local base commanders, and the educational service officers--the postsecondary institutions, the accrediting agencies, and in some situations the states.

Subsequent discussions following the Zimmer presentation at the COPA meeting led to the idea of developing a case-study approach to evaluate educational operations and programs offered on military installations by civilian postsecondary institutions. The approach would be patterned after the evaluation model used by the regional accrediting commissions. DOD officials expressed interest in funding such a study if COPA developed an acceptable plan for implementation.

Dr. Kenneth E. Young, president of COPA, agreed that the council would undertake the task of developing a case study of military base education. Dr. Grover J. Andrews, associate executive secretary of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, was asked to coordinate the efforts for COPA.

An ad hoc committee was appointed in the spring of 1977 to begin preliminary work on developing the concept. This committee was composed of Dr. William L. Flowers, Jr., associate dean, Extension Division, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Dr. Samuel L. Myers, former president of Bowie State College; Dr. Milton Grodsky, dean, University College, University of Maryland; and Dr. Armand Galfo, professor of higher education, College of William and Mary. This committee developed a concept paper by fall of 1977 which provided the basis for early discussions and reviews of the case-study idea among institutional, accrediting, and military educational officials.

In the summer of 1977 an advisory committee for the project was appointed. The committee included each of the executive officers of the nine regional accrediting commissions of postsecondary education and a representative of each of the branches of military service, the office of the secretary of defense, and the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. Mr. Gordon W. Sweet, executive secretary of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, was appointed chairman of the advisory committee. A list of advisory committee members is included in Appendix A.

Meetings of the advisory committee were held in conjunction with regularly scheduled COPA conferences in August 1977, January 1978, August 1978, and January 1979. At these meetings of the advisory committee the operational plans for the case study were refined and approved. The final meeting of the advisory committee was held on September 7, 1979.

Staff work for the project was provided by Dr. G. Jack Allen and Dr. Andrews of the Southern Association. Administrative support services were provided to COPA for the project by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

A detailed prospectus entitled "A Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases" was prepared by the project staff and served as the basis for funding of the project by the office of the secretary of defense in February 1979. A copy of the prospectus is included in Appendix B. Operational guidelines for implementation of the case study were prepared by the staff and include the following:

- Report of Military Bases Selected for Inclusion in the Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases;
- Instructions for the Institutional Report for the Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases;
- Guidelines for Military Base Case Study Visiting Committees; and
- Instructions for the Committee Report.

Copies of these operational guidelines and the various letters of invitation (to military base commanders, institutional heads, and visiting committee members) are included in Appendix C.

The nature of the study as it emerged in its final form can best be described as "holistic." That is, the case study was designed to assess college-level education provided by civilian institutions on military installations by an indepth review of all such educational programs offered on a military installation. Case-study sites were selected which involved 25 installations: 6 Air Force, 9 Army, 3 Marine, and 7 Navy. Institutions offering degree program at all levels (associate, baccalaureate, master's, and doctorate were included, as well as certain certificate and non-degree programs. The sites visited and the institutions involved are listed in Appendix D.

Each regional association had primary responsibility for on-site visits to the military installations located within its geographical territory. Members of the on-site visiting committees were experienced, volunteer evaluators used by the regional accrediting commissions. Fifty-four different evaluators, some of whom served on more than one team, were called upon to form the case study teams. A list of evaluators is included in Appendix E.

Evaluators from each regional served on committees as follows:

Association	No. of teams	No. of Evaluators	Locations visited within each region
Southern Association	9	22	5
Western Association	7	12	1
North Central Association	5	6	1
Northwest Association	3	5	1
Middle States Association	3	6	1
New England Association	2	3	0

The teams were more national in scope than may normally be found in a regional accreditation on-site review. Each team had at least two regional accrediting commissions represented in its membership. Three teams had four regionals represented, and three teams had three of the regionals contributing to the composition of the team. Complete details on the operational procedures used in the case study are presented in Part II.

Purpose

The specific purposes of the case study were developed from three basic assumptions:

1. Military personnel should be provided off-duty educational opportunities during their tour of duty for: improving their value to the military service; preparing for a future career upon return to civilian life; and upgrading their own educational background.
2. On-base non-military education programs beyond the high school level can best be offered by accredited postsecondary educational institutions.
3. The responsibility for the quality of postsecondary educational programs offered by institutions on military bases is a responsibility which is shared by the institution, the military, and the appropriate regional accrediting commission.

The general purpose of the case study was to make a comprehensive assessment of the postsecondary, degree-granting educational programs offered by colleges and universities on military installations for service personnel in all branches. The study was to include an analysis and evaluation of the various and complex roles, formal and informal, of the principal partners affecting the quality of the programs offered and the educational experience of the military service student.

The recommendations made as a result of the case study are designed to improve and strengthen the educational experience for military personnel; to achieve a greater level of commitment and consistency of quality in the educational programs within and among the various branches of the military; to define clearly the roles and responsibilities of the principal partners in the educational enterprise for the military; and to provide the framework for a reasonable, workable, and reliable system for quality assurance of educational programs and courses offered on military installations by colleges and universities.

Rationale for the Case Study

There were many compelling reasons for an assessment of postsecondary education on military installations to be made ad this particular time in history, any one of which provided adequate justification and reasonable rationale for the case study. Among the reasons were the following:

- The growth and size of the civilian-sponsored postsecondary education enterprise for military personnel since World War II.
- The variety of educational programs and levels of degrees offered--associate, baccalaureate, master's, and doctorates--on military installations.
- The adaptation of nontraditional modes and methods of instruction and credit evaluations by institutions operating on military installations.

- A growing national concern as to the quality of the education being received by military personnel in programs offered on military installations.
- A legitimate questioning by the U. S. Department of Defense, Congress, and other government officials whether the value received is a reasonable return on the dollar expended for educational purposes for military personnel.
- The use of "educational opportunity" by the military services as a motivating factor for enlistments in the voluntary services.
- An unclear definition of appropriate roles and relationships for the major partners (e.g., military, institutions, accrediting agencies, states) in providing education of quality to personnel in military service.
- The variation in purposes and goals within and among the branches of the military service and the DOD.
- The need to verify or refute charges that on-base postsecondary education for military personnel is shoddy and lacking in academic quality by a comprehensive, indepth assessment by a nationally representative group of peers from the postsecondary education community.

The rationale for the case study includes each of these issues, and in implementing the project, each of these issues has been addressed if not wholly, at least in part.

The increasing desire of the U.S. military services to provide educational opportunities for their personnel has been met in recent years by a corresponding willingness on the part of many civilian postsecondary educational institutions to extend their programs to military installations locally, nationally, and internationally. Recognizing the need for these programs, regional accrediting commissions have encouraged member institutions to cooperate with military services in providing appropriate undergraduate and graduate programs.

Educational needs and purposes may vary considerably from base to base. Programs and courses should provide educational experiences which: (1) contribute to increased effectiveness in a present or future military occupation, (2) provide skills for a second career, or (3) are for personal enrichment. In the process of meeting these varying needs, institutions have usually modified the traditional concepts of campus residence, the physical setting, and the methods of credit accumulation in order to develop programs that serve off-duty service personnel. However, differences in administrative practices should not reduce the quality of the educational experience.

The availability of educational opportunities has become a major recruitment tool of the military services. If manpower needs for volunteer service personnel are met, as many as one-fifth of this country's high school graduates may initiate their postsecondary education while in the military. Some military bases have become major educational centers in terms of the range of programs, numbers of students, and the variety and number of postsecondary institutions involved. As many as 14 institutions have provided programs or courses on a single base.

The major responsibility for programs on military bases is shared by the appropriate military authority and the institutions involved. There must be a mutual understanding as to the objectives and needs not only of the military, but also of the students and of the institutions providing educational experiences. All parties must be concerned with program quality. In addition, there must be cooperation with appropriate accrediting commissions, state agencies, and the Veterans Administration, which estimates that about 250,000 military personnel currently on active duty will use their VA benefits before discharge.

Over the years it has been generally assumed that regionally accredited institutions were offering quality programs on military bases. Recently, however, some educators, including those from the regional accrediting commissions, have expressed concern about the quality and effectiveness of on-base programs. This concern has grown with the expansion of some programs to locations thousands of miles from the parent institution and the problems involved in evaluating such programs.

Regional accreditation applies to the institution as a whole and means that the institution is in compliance with the established criteria or standards of the accrediting commission. In the recent past, accreditation did not necessarily imply that an institution had the resources necessary or the capability to deliver its educational programs on off-campus sites. Verification of the institution's ability to offer quality programs in off-campus settings could not be made unless the programs and locations in question had been evaluated by on-site visiting committees from the accrediting body. Military officials have had a difficult task determining the holistic value of the on-base educational programs because of the present individual evaluation of institutions on a base by accrediting agencies and the lapse of time before all institutions and programs have been evaluated. Furthermore, program approval by state agencies has been uneven due to a lack of procedures and because the programs are provided on federal installations, which are usually not under state jurisdiction.

Contributing to the problem is the decentralized nature of military education. In some services, program development is left primarily to base authorities. Base commanders, education officers, other military officials, and concerned individuals in the office of the secretary of defense find it difficult to compare the quality of programs, except in numbers of students and courses, with those of other bases having similar characteristics. Little has been done by the military to determine systematically the appropriate educational programs for a particular base or branch of service.

These factors have made appropriate an indepth study of the quality of postsecondary education on military bases, especially those which offer a variety of degree programs involving a significant number of institutions. The case study is an attempt to provide an account of the current situation at one point in time. The recommendations in Part V are designed to assist the military, the institutions, and the accrediting agencies to reexamine present roles and procedures and to plan for improvements in policy and program implementation.

PART II: THE CASE-STUDY APPROACH

Design of the Study

This study of postsecondary education offered on military installations was conducted under the aegis of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation by the nine regional postsecondary accrediting commissions for the U.S. Department of Defense. The study used the case-study method with on-site committees of peer evaluators visiting selected sites representative of all branches of the armed services.

Building upon the three basic assumptions for the study as stated in Part I, the following specific objectives for the case study were developed:

1. To make an assessment of postsecondary, degree-granting programs offered by regionally accredited institutions on military bases.
2. To evaluate the effectiveness of civilian, postsecondary educational institutions in the delivery of degree programs for personnel on selected military bases.
3. To identify the current roles of: (1) postsecondary institutions, (2) military organizations and personnel, (3) the states, (4) regional accrediting commissions, and (5) other organizations or agencies involved in the provision of on-base, postsecondary educational programs by civilian institutions.

4. To identify and make recommendations concerning the functions essential for an on-going system of quality control in on-base, postsecondary educational programs provided by civilian institutions.

5. To make recommendations concerning the proper roles to be performed by each of the participating organizations identified in 3. above.

6. To provide a reservoir of data about postsecondary educational programs provided for military bases by civilian institutions for use by the military (base commanders, education services officers, and Department of Defense personnel), institutional personnel, and accrediting commissions in the development of of appropriate policies and procedures for such programs.

The case-study method was selected to meet the objectives of the study. The design of the case study included on-site, peer evaluation as developed by the regional accrediting commissions for postsecondary institutions. Though some of the procedures and criteria used in the case study were similar to those used in the evaluation of academic institutions, it was clearly emphasized that the study did not directly involve the accreditation status of any of the participating colleges or universities.

Information for the case study was gathered from institutions participating in the educational programs on selected military installations, from the DOD educational representatives for the various branches of service, and from the on-site committees of institutional peer evaluators.

The report from the institution provided basic information on its total off-campus involvement in military education and specific data on the programs offered at military installations to be visited in the study. The report included pertinent data on the following topics:

1. Administration and finance
2. Curriculum
3. Advanced placement policy and procedures
4. Faculty and staff
5. Evaluation systems
6. On-base quality assurance procedures of the parent campus
7. Equipment and facilities on base.

A copy of the form used to gather institutional data is included in Appendix C, Part 1.

Information provided by the educational representatives of the various branches of the military included facts and procedural data on the following:

1. Procurement of on-base degree programs
2. Program requirements
3. Space allocations
4. Budget allocations
5. Student services
6. Evaluation

These reports were prepared by the base education services officers for the DOD educational representatives and, in most cases, were made available to the visiting committee at the time of the on-site evaluation. The report prepared by each base and each institution combined to provide essential information on the total educational program of a military installation for the case-study visit. A copy of the complete outline of information provided by the military is included in Appendix C, Part 4.

The third type of report, which completed the basic information gathered in the case study, was the written evaluation of the on-site visiting committee. These reports provided factual information on the effectiveness of the educational program at the military installations visited and included a professional opinion as to the appropriate roles that should be performed by the various parties (i.e., institution, military, accrediting agencies, states, Veterans Administration) in the selection, development, and delivery of quality education for military personnel.

These three sets of reports, as well as written responses from the participating institutions, provided the basis for designing the summary report on military base education. The summary report includes the major findings from each of the 11 case studies, the general conclusions and recommendations, and proposed policies for education offered on military installations for service personnel by colleges and universities.

Composition of the Teams

The on-site visiting committees to the military installations were composed of evaluators used by the various regional accrediting commissions for postsecondary education. Each of the regionals provided a list of trained and experienced evaluators considered to be appropriate for the case study.

Among those recommended were many individuals experienced in chairing visiting committees as well as those experienced in evaluating the various academic disciplines and career fields and administrative processes.

In most cases the regional accrediting association responsible for the geographical area in which the military installation was located assumed a primary role by providing the chairman for the visiting team. Each team was composed of representatives of two or more of the regional accrediting commissions taking part.

Each committee included a chairman, a financial officer, and a number of program specialists. In a few cases a librarian was included to evaluate the learning resources of the base. Because other organizations and agencies have significant responsibilities for the educational programs on military installations, a number of observers were invited to accompany each team. At the onset of the case study it was agreed that the observers should play an important role during the study as resource persons; however, the number of observers should be limited to no more than four on any one visit. Represented as observers on at least one case study visit were the office of the secretary of defense, the various military services (Army, Air Force, Marines, and Navy), the Veterans Administration, Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges, the Education Commission of the States, the U.S. Office of

Education, and a state licensing officer. A list of the observers may be found in Appendix F.

The visiting teams were charged to provide a professional opinion, based on their analysis of the reports and the findings of the on-site visit, about the appropriate roles in the development and delivery of on-base, postsecondary education for institutions, military officials, accrediting agencies, and the states. A copy of the "Guidelines for Military Base Case Study Visiting Committees" may be found in Appendix C, Part 3.

Fifty-four evaluators, including representatives of all six of the regional accrediting associations, and 25 observers, representing 10 different agencies participated in the on-site visits. In addition, five accrediting commission staff members accompanied visiting committees.

Nature of the Reports

Visiting committees were asked to use the "Guidelines for Military Base Case Study Visiting Committees" and the "Instructions for the Committee Report" (Appendix C, Part 3) in preparing their reports. They were instructed to describe and make an assessment of the overall postsecondary education program on the base and how it was incorporated into the purposes and goals of the service branch. The committees were also asked to describe and make a professional assessment of each institution's programs offered on the base in terms of currently accepted and recognized good practice. This assessment was to be accomplished without applying the particular standards of any regional or specialized accrediting agency. Specifically, this visit was not to be an evaluation for accreditation.

In addition, the committees were asked to describe the actual roles played by the institutions, the various military components, the regional accrediting commissions, the state agencies, and any other organization that might effect the educational process. Finally, they were to make recommendations as to the appropriate roles for these organizations and institutions.

Reports on institutional programs prepared by the institutions themselves were to be furnished in advance of each visit to those committee members whose academic expertise was appropriate to these programs. The chairman of the committee was to confirm the institutional assignments of the committee members and make additional assignments at the on-site organizational meeting. General instructions to the committees requested as much description and narrative as time permitted to cover those areas of concern found in the "Guidelines." Observations of factual matters, based on institutional reports, military reports, class observations, and interviews could stand alone. Committees were then asked to evaluate and assess their findings, draw conclusions, and make recommendations. These assessments and recommendations were to represent the consensus of the entire committee.

Committee members were to submit to the chairman drafts of their parts of the report at the end of the visit. After editing by the chairman and circulation among the committee members, each report was to be sent to the project staff and then forwarded to the appropriate base commander and institutions for correction of factual errors. These corrections, as judged appropriate by the committee chairman, were to be incorporated into the final draft of each report.

The reports received by the project staff were lengthy, with the format varying slightly according to the style of the committees. Each report contained many suggestions and recommendations based on the findings. Though differences did occur, general conclusions and recommendations were, for the most part, similar among committees that visited bases operated by the same service branch.

Strengths of the Approach

1. One of the strengths of the case-study approach was the enthusiastic involvement of a large number of educators. Although there was no compensation provided except for actual expenses, almost without exception those contacted were eager to participate. Some individuals made extraordinary efforts to fit the visits into their schedules and,

if this was not possible, asked to be considered for future service. Members of the committee that evaluated programs in Alaska and the Pacific were required to take 12 days out of their schedules, a considerable sacrifice of time and energy.

The idea of having one small group of evaluators visit all the sites was rejected. While this approach might have produced greater consistency in the reports and in the findings and recommendations, it would also have made personal biases consistent. A degree of consistency in procedure and format was maintained by having some committee members and chairmen serve on more than one committee and by project staff involvement. The overlapping of members and chairmen was achieved on seven of the committees.

2. The experience and qualifications of committee members was an obvious strength. All of the members were experienced in college teaching and/or administration, and all had served on accrediting teams. A minority of the evaluators had previously been on visiting committees to military bases. Some might consider it a weakness of the study that many of the committee members had not been involved in the assessment or administration of military education programs. Others might see this as a strength. All committees, however, included at least one and sometimes as many as three members with experience in the assessment of programs on military

bases, usually including the chairman. Observers from the military services were available as resource persons to the committees as were the project staff.

3. A further strength of the study was the willing cooperation and assistance of the following people: (1) the service branch representatives in the DOD; (2) the commanding officers, education services officers (ESOs), education officers, education specialists, and support personnel at the bases visited; and (3) the institutional personnel, including presidents, deans, directors, coordinators, and other representatives involved in postsecondary education on military installations. With few exceptions, committees were provided the needed information and had access to records, to students, and to key military and institutional personnel at the installations. Concerted efforts were made to provide the support necessary for the committees to carry out their evaluations in an effective and efficient manner.

The nature of the evaluations was somewhat different from what most committee members had experienced in a typical accrediting visit. Instead of examining one institution and its various programs and components, the committees were challenged to evaluate the organization and educational efforts of a number of institutions operating on a site remote from the home campuses. In addition, the committees had to examine and assess how these educational operations meshed with the military operations on base. For this reason, each institution was asked to have present at the site at least one representative from the home campus who was knowledgeable about and responsible for the direct operation of that institution's military programs. This resource helped make the task of the committees easier and contributed to more accurate reports. Ideally, the base visits should have been supplemented with visits to the home campuses; however, that was done only in several instances when the home campus was not far from the base.

The usual procedure for dividing the committee workload was accomplished by assigning one or more committee member to describe and evaluate a particular institution's program(s). If the program was narrowly focused, for example, on an MBA, perhaps one person--with the appropriate academic specialty--was given the assignment. Several persons were sometimes assigned to institutions with more than one program or a broad undergraduate curriculum. Personal bias as a factor (i.e., a sole evaluator of a program might be particularly harsh on that institution, and a single evaluator for a program might be reticent to be overly critical) was reduced significantly by the group nature of the effort. The findings and recommendations regarding each institution were discussed by the committee meeting as a whole and approved by the group.

4. Another strength of the study was reported by committee members. Since the evaluations were not for the purpose of accreditation, there was often an atmosphere of openness on the part of the institutional personnel toward committee members, especially after the first day of the visit.

Weaknesses of the Approach

1. Some problems resulted from the restricted time frame of the study. For some of the early visits there was only a short time available to prepare the institutional questionnaire. In several cases these completed questionnaires did not reach the committee members prior to the visit. Committee members, however, did obtain necessary information on their arrival.

2. The case-study process has not been used before as an evaluative format for postsecondary education on military bases. Improvements in the process would certainly be made in subsequent uses. Division of responsibility for on-base education is considerable. The armed services, VA, states and individual institutions are all involved and in many instances the interactions are not well defined.

Achievement of Project Goals

The findings and recommendations contained in this report and in the individual case reports indicate that the goals and objectives of the project have been effectively achieved in large part.

The first two objectives--to make an assessment of postsecondary degree programs offered by regionally accredited institutions on military bases and to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs--were accomplished with regard to particular programs and also the totality of programs. Objectives three and five were to identify the current roles and make recommendations concerning the proper roles of: (1) postsecondary institutions, (2) military organizations and personnel, (3) the states, (4) regional accrediting commissions, and (5) other organizations or agencies involved in the provision of on-base postsecondary educational programs provided by civilian institutions. These objectives were accomplished, although with respect to the states and other organizations and agencies the committees usually had insufficient information to comment in any great detail.

An important aspect of the study, objective four, was to identify and make recommendations concerning the functions essential for a continuing system of quality control in the on-base postsecondary educational programs provided by civilian institutions. Each committee--while taking into consideration the flexibility required on base--identified and recommended those elements of quality control that are essential in providing adequate collegiate education.

The last objective was to provide a reservoir of data about postsecondary educational programs offered on military bases. This objective was accomplished to some extent. The reports from the institutions, bases, and the visiting committees provide considerable data useful to all parties. Future collection of such data from institutions and the military would require development of a standardized system.

PART III: FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The following summary of findings is drawn from the reports submitted by the visiting committees and is limited to information contained therein. The summary is not intended to single out bases that were experiencing problems in providing postsecondary educational services or those which were exemplary. Similarly, there is no intent to identify in this report the excellent programs conducted by some institutions or those considered deficient in one or more aspect. Detailed evaluations and recommendations are contained in the individual base reports provided to the office of the secretary of defense.

Postsecondary Institutions

In reporting their findings concerning postsecondary institutions, visiting committees examined institutional policies and practices in the following areas with reference to on-base programs:

1. Institutional Purpose and Goals
2. Organization and Administration
3. Admissions
4. Curriculum
5. Instruction and Quality Assurance
6. Learning Resources and Physical Facilities
7. Student Services
8. Financial Resources

As has been stated, committees were asked to determine whether or not institutional policies and practices were in accord with recognized good practice and whether or not they were similar to policies and practices on the home campus.

In the summaries of institutional findings that follow, the general conclusions in each section usually precede a list of examples of practices--some encountered very infrequently--which were viewed with concern by the visiting committee. This listing was not included merely to be critical but to be instructive. Examples are drawn from all of the base reports and do not portray the state of programs on any one base. Furthermore, the committee reports are not quantitative in nature. That is, they do not say how many institutions engaged in this or that practice. Each committee commented upon those aspects of institutional programs that it deemed important, and there was some variation from committee to committee.

In the summary report neither institutions nor individuals are mentioned by name.

1. Institutional Purposes and Goals--The committees generally found that the statements of purpose and goals of institutions serving military installations provided for this particular outreach and were consistent with the aims of the voluntary education program of the military. There was usually an attempt to mesh the goals of the military and those of the institutions.

In most instances programs were considered appropriate for military personnel, although military needs and objectives at the base level were not always precisely stated. The objectives of some of the programs were cited as especially appropriate. For example, one graduate program offered on more than 60 installations was found to be closely related to the needs of its target clientele.

There are, nonetheless, areas of potential and actual problems between the military and civilian institutions in regard to purpose and goals. On some bases there are educational needs that can be satisfied with short-term programs of higher education. Operation of such programs, however, is generally inconsistent with the traditional educational purpose and mission of colleges and universities which seek to build long-range, stable programs.

In credit and degree programs on their home campuses, postsecondary institutions attempt to provide students with a comprehensive learning experience. The notion of a "credit" course itself implies a goal, a "program," toward which this credit is being applied. On military installations it is sometimes difficult to discern a pattern of comprehensive learning experiences. Many excellent courses are offered which do not comprise a sequenced program leading directly to a degree. For example, approximately 90 percent of the students in the undergraduate courses of an institution serving a large number of personnel were not degree candidates. The question to be asked is not, Are these courses worthwhile? In most cases they are. The question is, In offering a potpourri of courses that on a college campus would normally be sequenced parts of a comprehensive learning experience called a "program," do the goals of the institutions and the military coincide? If it is desired by the armed services and the institutions that military personnel should have the opportunity to sample a wide variety of courses for individual satisfaction without being enrolled in a program with definite objectives, then offerings of this kind may be appropriate. The importance of academic counseling in explaining to students the credit applicability of such courses to a comprehensive degree program was noted by the committees for the institutions and the military alike.

2. Organization and Administration--The committees considered good administrative practice for on-base operations to include the following elements: (1) The final approval for the hiring of individual faculty should be the responsibility of the appropriate department heads or deans on the home campus. (2) Final decisions on curriculum should be made by the appropriate committees and academic personnel on the home campus. (3) Administrative personnel should possess appropriate qualifications. (4) There should be input by off-campus faculty into the process of curriculum development. (5) There should be clear lines of authority in the

administration of on-base programs and effective continuity and communication requiring frequent visits by campus academic administrators.

Most postsecondary programs offered on military installations appear to be adequately administered from the home campuses in regard to the first three elements. For example, one institution required approval of all of its overseas core and adjunct faculty and the courses they could teach by the academic departments at its home campus. Course offerings, except for a few special-topic courses, were reviewed and approved by the academic departments on the home campus and also by an academic council of the institution. Administrators for this institution were appropriately qualified and highly competent.

Academic faculty and deans at other institutions, however, were sometimes not in the approval chain, and in a few cases, base program directors lacking appropriate credentials were called upon to screen prospective faculty.

In regard to (4) and (5) deficiencies were noted. Except in the case of institutions that used instructors from the home campus, on-base faculty had little or no voice in curriculum development. The administration of most programs was characterized by clear lines of authority, adequate continuity of personnel, and adequate administrative communication. However, the committees found that for many programs the frequency of visits to bases by campus administrators was insufficient for them to be fully informed of the strengths and weaknesses of programs and instructors and of the needs of military students.

There were a number of questionable practices noted by the committee. Illustrative of these are the following: Several institutions allowed local base program directors to teach courses--one allowed two courses per term--a possible conflict of interest considering the fact that these persons also counsel students in respect to their course selection. One local program director was also employed by another institution serving the base. On one base the administration of an institution's program had devolved upon the base ESO and his staff, an abdication of institutional responsibility. The office of educational services recruited and enrolled students and performed related logistical functions. A half-time liaison officer for the institution was recruited by the ESO, who also directed his activities.

3. Admissions--The admissions policies and practices of institutions serving military installations with associate and baccalaureate degree programs were generally found to be adequate and also consistent with policies and practices followed on home campuses. Admissions policies and practices at the graduate level, however, were often not sufficiently rigorous.

The committees found that, for the most part, admissions to associate and baccalaureate programs were open, usually requiring a high school diploma or the GED. This policy was generally consistent with that used on the home campus. With respect to institutional undergraduate admissions policies and practices, committees found much to compliment, and there were very few negative comments. One institution serving numerous bases did not, in practice, require high school transcripts or proof of success on the GED. The prospective student merely signed a statement affirming GED or diploma completion. Several institutions transferred courses in which a grade of "D" had been earned.

Institutions offering the better graduate programs provided for adequate screening of students through selective GPA and test score requirements. One of these institutions normally required a GPA of 2.5 or higher on a 4-point scale for the final 60 units of undergraduate work and a combined score of at least 1000 on the Graduate Record Examination. The committees expressed concern, however, over the significant number of institutions operating with essentially open admissions at the graduate level. Weaknesses identified here included: (1) the requirement of only an undergraduate degree with no GPA or test score minimums for admission, (2) the requirement of a low GPA as the sole criterion, a deficiency made more serious in a time of grade inflation, and (3) the lack of appropriate course prerequisites for entrance into graduate programs. In addition, several institutions used off-campus admissions criteria different from those used on the home campus.

4. Curriculum--The committees found that the curricula of programs offered were appropriate for the majority of institutions but that there were many significant deviations from what is considered sound practice, especially in the area of credit granted for prior learning.

In general, the curricula of undergraduate programs were found to be appropriate for the credentials granted in respect to course requirements and described content. Nevertheless, several baccalaureate programs were deemed to be inadequate because they did not incorporate a recognized core and identifiable concentration as a major. In essence they were considered substandard extensions of associate programs which could present a false impression to educators and prospective employers and cause difficulties for students trying to go on to graduate programs. One committee questioned as inappropriate the awarding of a BA in Liberal Arts with a concentration in real estate. Students in programs offered by one community college complained that there was no hands-on work in some laboratory courses. Because of the absence or inadequacy of laboratory facilities, many courses, such as the natural sciences, that are normally an essential part of college offerings, even for liberal art students, could not be offered.

There were significant problems with the curricula of many graduate programs. A general concern was the frequent lack of prerequisites for graduate programs, especially in business. This situation forces instructors to deal with students of such varying backgrounds that much time must be spent on what is essentially undergraduate instruction. The problem is compounded by the fact that many of the graduate programs are not course-sequenced; that is, students can begin at any point. This produces unavoidable repetition if students with no prerequisites are to be given adequate background and inevitably reduces the level of educational outcomes for a particular program.

The committees also noted that many graduate courses were not really graduate in content, but were fifth year baccalaureates, and that several programs were misleading in title and degree designation. Some course descriptions were identical in the undergraduate and graduate categories. A program designed to prepare students for "administrative leadership" incorporated only nine of 36 units related to administration. Another graduate program had no common core of study and the curriculum did not appear to be designed to provide the knowledge and skills implied by its title. The committees noted, too, that several programs were offered on base that were not available on the home campus.

The committees noted many instances of what they considered the potential for excessive granting of credit for military training, military service, CLEP, correspondence courses, and experiential learning. The following are examples of practices questioned by the committees:

At one institution it was possible to accumulate all credits for a primary concentration (major) through CLEP, transfer, and correspondence without taking a course in the concentration from that institution.

Several institutions granted credits for experiential learning for students in off-campus programs, but did not for students at the home campus.

Students at several institutions could obtain a BA with no more than 30 semester hours in residence in the institution's on-base program. Several institutions offering associate programs had minimal requirements for hours taken with the college. One required only 10 quarter hours for students in the on-base program, while 24 were required on campus.

The requirements for an associate degree at one institution could be completed by taking only five of 90 quarter hours from that institution. Seventy hours could be completed through CLEP, assessment of military training, career experience, etc. Only 20 hours in traditional coursework were required, including the five hours in residence.

In one instance, examinations of a student file showed that credit given for CLEP subjects overlapped with credit given for coursework. This same file noted that a math CLEP score was considered too low, so the student was advised to submit the score to the New York Board of Regents for validation. If validated, the score would then be accepted as transfer credit.

In one master's program more than one-half of the total hours could be fulfilled by transfer credits.

Committees suspected that there was competition by institutions in granting CLEP and other credit in order to build enrollments. Several committees expressed concern that an extremely liberal policy on the granting of credit for CLEP and other tests, training, military service, and experiential learning could change the character of an institution from that of a school--communicating a coherent body of knowledge to and developing analytical skills of students--to an inappropriate role as a credentialling office that evaluates--or has some other agency evaluate--the fragmented educational experiences imparted by others.

The committees were also concerned that, in some on-base situations, considerable numbers of students were taking courses that had no discernible pattern or overall coherence, a development mentioned under Institutional Purposes and Goals.

5. Instruction and Quality Assurance--The quality of most undergraduate programs was adequate and, on occasion, excellent. Both faculty credentials and the level and rigor of instruction were generally acceptable. Regarding graduate-level programs on the other hand, committees expressed reservations concerning both the credentials of the faculty in some programs and the level and rigor of instruction. The widely dispersed nature of the educational effort on military bases has made institutional monitoring of program quality difficult and has reduced the academic atmosphere to a minimum. Not all institutions have made sufficient efforts to develop innovative systems of quality assurance to overcome these difficulties.

The matter of faculty qualifications was examined closely by the committees. For the most part, faculty members were hired with the approval of department heads or academic deans at the home campus, a practice strongly supported by these visiting committees. There were, however, some glaring examples of bad practice in the hiring of faculty. One community college allowed instructors to teach one term before presenting proof of their qualifications and a second term while paperwork was being evaluated. Some of these instructors were not qualified.

Qualifications of instructors varied according to the programs of the institution, the base, and sometimes within the same program offered on several bases. Generally, undergraduate faculty members were deemed qualified, but some programs were singled out for improvement. For example, in the undergraduate business faculty at an institution offering a baccalaureate in economics, only two of 14 instructors had doctorates. It was found, particularly in graduate programs, that considerably fewer of the adjunct faculty had terminal degrees than did the full-time faculty. At one base, none of the faculty teaching for an institution in a graduate management program had a terminal degree in business or management. A situation that surfaced occasionally was one in which well-qualified people were teaching outside their fields of expertise. An extreme example was the case of four undergraduate instructors in one program, each of whom had taught seven different courses in 1977-78. In a very few cases, off-campus instructors were perhaps more qualified than those on campus.

As might be expected, the pattern of faculty employment and development varied considerably. No one pattern was endorsed by the committees, but quality control was deemed essential in any pattern. Institutions offering programs at the associate and baccalaureate level tended to rely primarily on adjunct faculty; some institutions used them almost exclusively. One institution offering programs abroad used annually appointed core faculty along with term-appointed faculty. Another institution brought in full-time faculty for an intensive weekend format. Several institutions rotated faculty members from base to base. At the graduate level there was, again, considerable variation. Some institutions used adjunct faculty exclusively in their graduate offerings; others used both full-time and adjunct instructors. At some bases only full-time faculty were used by certain institutions.

The committees had serious reservations concerning the extensive use in most programs of adjunct faculty, many of whom had had no previous teaching experience. In many cases adjunct faculty members had little academic contact with the home campus or with other instructors in their particular program. Interaction with colleagues was minimal. Adjunct faculty members had little knowledge of or insight into developments at the parent campus and played almost no role in normal faculty functions, such as curriculum development and policy determination. Attempts to create a college "community" resembling that found on a campus were seldom found. Some institutions were taking positive steps toward the academic development of their adjunct faculty by arranging frequent faculty meetings, conducting teaching techniques workshops, providing faculty development publications and making funds available for attendance at professional conferences.

The dispersed nature of on-base programs contributed to another problem. The academic deans and department chairmen who are responsible for the quality of classroom instruction on the parent campus usually played little role in monitoring quality on military bases. The major instrument for evaluating on-base instruction was the evaluation of the instructor by students. There was little classroom visitation by qualified academic personnel, and there was no significant attempt to compare student achievement in off-campus programs with that in programs on campus. Institutions operating on military bases rarely made use of common exams to assess student outcomes.

Most institutions used compressed schedules to accommodate the military student. Committees questioned whether students meeting, in the case of one program, for a total of 36 hours during two weekends (Friday-Sunday, usually one or two weeks apart) could master the indepth knowledge and analytical skills necessary to be awarded three semester hours of graduate credit. An instructor for a Friday class (6-10 p.m.) in this example assigned homework to be turned in by 8:00 a.m. the following morning. This not only makes difficult the consolidation of learning, but also eliminates the necessary time for study and research activity.

Although instructional quality was considered to be generally adequate, committee members had only limited time to examine syllabi, observe classes, and talk with students and instructors. However, several problems were observed and noted:

Grade inflation was evident in most undergraduate programs, although it was recognized that this is sometimes true of on-campus programs.

Information and syllabi from parent campuses frequently gave too little guidance to instructors. If anything, more guidance is needed in on-base situations.

Provisions for make-up work by absent students were inadequate in some instances. Often there were no formal procedures.

Graduate study was, in too many cases, confined to textbooks and books of readings. Research skills and other traditional aspects of "scholarship" were neglected.

Course instructors often had poor working relationships with base librarians, contributing to the inadequacy of library support for programs.

In some graduate programs students were exposed to a very limited number of faculty members.

The remedial problems of students accepted into programs were sometimes ignored. ESOs were often called upon to identify these students.

6. Learning Resources and Physical Facilities--The committees found that, on the majority of bases, physical

facilities were inadequate to support many of the programs provided. Neither the amount of space allocated nor the condition of classrooms and offices was conducive to learning or the effective operation of the programs. Though the memoranda of agreement between the service branches and institutions provided that the military make available "appropriate" facilities, institutions were not insistent that these facilities be appropriate. Learning resources were marginal at best for undergraduate programs and were so grossly inadequate for graduate-level work that this situation should preclude the offering of most graduate programs.

Committees found that space allocation for classroom and offices and the maintenance of these facilities was dependent to a large degree on a combination of factors: (1) the interest, understanding, and cooperation of commanding officers, (2) the persistence and personality of the education services officer, (3) the funds made available by the service branches, and (4) the extent to which institutions were willing to accept what was provided. In general, physical facilities on Air Force and Marine installations were considered minimally adequate and sometimes good--not fancy, but structurally safe and sound. Facilities on Army installations were generally (but not in all cases) inadequate, and those provided by the Navy were often unacceptable. The following are some negative comments recorded concerning Army educational facilities:

- Classroom facilities are "substandard," "delapidated and depressing," "unattractive and crowded."
- Classrooms are "hot in summer and cold in winter."
- Office space is small and shared, making confidential conversations almost impossible.
- Equipment for vocational-technical programs could not be used because of lack of facilities.

For the Navy the situation generally was worse as indicated by these recorded comments:

- Physical facilities are "atrocious," classrooms "dirty, unkempt... with some windows broken."
- Rooms are too small, chalkboards too small, a lack of chairs, with support facilities so poor as to be classified non-existent.
- A critical shortage of office and classroom space precludes a reasonable implementation of the off-duty education needs and requirements.
- One course was held behind a folding screen in the food-and-drink vending machine room and lounge.
- Aboard ship in one program, "lack of space for storage of books, equipment, laboratories, and other materials is critical. Minimally acceptable learning conditions are not being provided. There are small classrooms, poorly ventilated, insufficently lighted, and entirely too noisy for even a minimally adequate learning experience to take place."

Science laboratory facilities were almost universally inadequate, as was computer access for upper-level and graduate courses in business, a serious deficiency.

With regard to learning resources the committees found that, with a few exceptions, institutions were providing little support for their programs in terms of books, reference materials, periodicals, and primary source materials. Such institutions did provide for limited purchase of resources and limited reserve collections and personal materials. Overall, materials in base libraries were found to be insufficient to support many upper-level programs and almost all graduate programs where training in research is essential.

Library buildings ranged from small and cramped to modern and spacious facilities. In order to add new books, some librarians had to weed collections drastically because of space limitations.

Students in the United States had varying degrees of access to local public libraries and to institutional libraries. One of the arguments for the extension of college programs to bases, however, has been that many potential students would not become actual students unless programs were brought to their doorstep. Using this rationale, the committees deemed the use of local and institutional libraries--unless they were in very close proximity to a base--to be an inadequate substitute for on-base libraries. Using outside library resources is a special difficulty for students without transportation.

Extensive interlibrary loan systems were often available to base librarians in the United States, Germany, and the Pacific, and several institutions were equipped to send materials from their home campuses. One institution had devised a system whereby students could use a WATS line to order books or copies of journal articles directly from the parent campus. The committees considered these systems to be a definite asset, but only a partial substitute for locally available resources. On-site availability of materials is especially critical in courses with compressed scheduling. For graduate students the opportunity for hands-on experience in an adequate library is important.

Other problem areas noted were:

- Not all base libraries had professional librarians, or librarians with backgrounds enabling them to deal with academic collections.
- Most base librarians were not available and the libraries were not open during the hours when needed by college students.
- Some libraries had funds available for academic purchases, but institutional personnel often did not communicate their requests.
- There was almost no space available for library collections aboard Navy ships.

7. Student Services--The committees found the student services in respect to counseling and record keeping to be adequate to good for most institutions. Student records were usually well maintained by institutional offices on base. In some instances full student records were maintained on base and at the home campus. In other instances minimum records were kept on base and more complete records at a regional center. It was noted, however, that institutional records were often kept in files that were not fire-proof and that were not secured in accordance with HEW requirements relating to confidentiality.

The committee recognized that the full range of student services, equivalent to those that exist in a campus setting, was not necessarily needed in a military setting. Some problems, however, existed in the area of student services:

- There was a lack of trained counselors on some bases.
- There was little counseling available to Navy students aboard ship where instruction actually takes place.
- In some instances students complained about the slow response of business offices at the home campus in processing checks and making credentials available.
- There was often a shortage of office space where confidential counseling can take place.
- Most institutions made no attempt to collect follow-up information on graduates.

8. Financial Resources--Analysis of the limited and possibly insufficient financial data available indicated that, for most institutions, expenditures in support of programs did not greatly exceed revenues generated. Tuition was often the total support of the on-base programs for those costs beyond the classrooms and utilities provided by the military. As might be expected, the greater the distance a program was from the home campus, the larger the portion of tuition and fees that must be invested in travel, administration, and communications.

Data available indicated that some institutions spent less per FTE student on military bases than per FTE student on campus. The level of expenditures for learning resources was considered too low by the committees. It was found that institutions need to obtain adequate resources for off-campus programs and identify them separately in the budget. There was no uniform financial form that could be completed by each institution for each base so that the financial arrangements to support educational programs could be determined and analyzed.

The committees found a wide variation in tuition charges among institutional programs. Those institutions that used local, adjunct faculty almost exclusively tended to pay lower per-course salaries, thus keeping costs down. What appeared to be some high-quality programs had a higher cost factor and charged a higher tuition, but appeared to be financially viable. Programs on some bases were operating at a loss, apparently because the programs were in the initial stages or because an institution was offering a program on numerous bases to enhance transfer, and there were insufficient students to support the program on some bases. One institution serving a large number of military students was losing large amounts of money in uncollectible debts from students.

In some instances the off-campus programs of institutions covered 100 percent of costs by revenues, while operational deficits on the home campus were made up by fund-raising and endowment. Also, the tuition charges of some institutions were higher on base than on campus. Institutions justified this situation on the grounds that they either did not receive state funding for off-campus, out-of-state students or they were not permitted to allow in-state tuition for military students.

There were several additional problem areas identified by the committees concerning financial resources:

Often institutions paid adjunct instructors according to the number of enrollees in their courses, leading to the possibility of underpaying instructors in the case of small classes and to the possibility of instructors catering to students to increase enrollment. In at least one instance a resident director was also teaching courses on this basis.

Institutional reliance almost completely on income from tuition in their military off-campus programs caused some concern about the depth and permanence of commitment, although it was recognized that it would be difficult for many institutions to subsidize these programs.

Military Organizations

Although the military services have performed a great service in supporting and making possible a significant and generally successful postsecondary educational effort on military bases, there is serious question as to the priority given to this type of education. Major weaknesses were identified in the planning, procurement, and administration of these programs.

The committees found on most bases a confusion between education and training and between offering random courses and a comprehensive learning experience. This problem begins in the contracting system which is left to the education services officer (or education specialist). After determination of the needs of the servicemen--an informal process usually involving judgments by the base commander and the ESO, perhaps coupled with a survey--the ESO procures an institution which can supply a program, a piece of a college. The programs, courses, and the number of students who attend them and graduate are mechanically counted by the military in assessing the effectiveness of the base postsecondary educational effort. There is no master plan for any of the service branches that provides for effective guidance and planning in the area of needs assessment and that sets forth a method of determining which institutions should be invited on post. There is no national selection process, nor is there a standard memorandum of agreement or contract, which could be modified to take into account special needs.

After an institution is invited onto a base, the ESO deals with the institution unilaterally. Despite the commitment and quality of most ESOs, they have not normally been connected with a college campus in which there are faculty, students, and administrators involved full time in educational development surrounded by laboratories, classrooms, libraries, and other academic structures. These individuals are called upon, nevertheless, to perform duties that resemble those of a dean on a college campus, with considerable control over classes, programs, and activities. The ESO has a crucial role in determining which programs should come on base or leave. However, the ESO operates without outside academic consulting help--although all institutions must be accredited--and is not qualified to be an adequate judge of reliable quality.

ESOs also have a difficult time in obtaining adequate classrooms and other physical facilities. Their success usually depends on the support of postsecondary education given by the base commander, a situation that makes commitments to the program uncertain over the long term. The low priority often given means funds for facilities must be diverted from some other source or purpose on base. Physical facilities, as a result, are often less than adequate.

The problem of resources is compounded by weaknesses in the usual memorandum of agreement between the military and the institution. Agreements are often too brief and extremely vague in delineating the responsibilities of each party for providing physical facilities or learning resources. Descriptions of facilities and resources and the quality expected are noticably lacking. Again, learning resources were often deficient.

Another point of concern was the lack of an appropriate educational community on base. Not only was there, in many cases, a lack of contact between faculty and personnel and the home campuses and little interaction among institutional faculty, but there was no significant interaction among the ESOs and the educational institutions. It was difficult to find an instance in which the ESO, the institutional representatives, and librarians operating on a particular site came together to help establish the goals, objectives, and educational climate for that particular site.

Areas of concern noted by committees also included the following:

- Unnecessary competition and duplication of programs were allowed on installations. This could lead to a lowering of quality to attract students.
- Clear lines of authority were lacking for accomplishing vital support needs. Much that was helpful occurred because sensitive and capable officers acted without real authority to help the education mission.
- Institutions had a tenuous existence on many bases with no long-term status. Assurance of permanence would encourage institutions to increase financial support of these programs.
- There was no formal process for renewing memoranda of agreement in terms of quality.
- On occasion ESOs had been enrolled in courses over which they exercised supervision.

Regional Accrediting Agencies

The committees found that military authorities and base education services officers relied to a great extent on the accreditation of the home campuses of institutions by the regional accrediting comissions as an assurance of quality for programs on base. Unfortunately, programs remote from the parent campus operating with uncertain futures, often relying on part-time faculty, and experiencing major fluctuations in enrollment can decline rapidly in quality. In a situation where careful monitoring is called for, infrequent evaluation is too often found.

Much is left to be desired in the area of evaluation and monitoring of quality in on-base programs. The committees noted that some programs had never been evaluated by the regional accrediting commission serving the region in which the home campus was located. In some instances accrediting teams had visited home campuses close to the bases, but had not included on-base visits to base programs in their evaluations. Conversely, some had been examined in recent years, several more than once. The record of evaluation of programs at the time of the reaffirmation of an institution's accreditation was spotty. The regional commissions have recently taken cooperative steps to increase their scrutiny of these programs. Most institutions have informed the regional commissions of the existence of their programs.

The committees noted that there were no provisions for ESO communication with the regional accrediting commissions when programs are brought on base or when agreements are renewed.

In essence, there was little contact between the ESO and the commissions on academic matters. Military officials never requested advisory committees from the regionals to give advice on individual programs or to assess the effectiveness of a total base program. Such consultations could be used to monitor program quality, initially and continually.

Other Agencies and the States

1. States--The committees found that state governing boards, departments of education, and approval agencies with some authority over postsecondary education generally provided limited oversight of programs on military bases and that this involvement varied in significance from state to state. States were limited legally by the fact that state authority does not generally extend to federal enclaves.

State boards of higher education did not appear to be interested in encouraging their institutions to extend their programs to bases, and they maintained closer supervision over in-state institutions than those operating from outside state boundaries. State systems and individual state institutions also varied in their commitment to providing postsecondary education on military bases.

Unwillingness on the part of local state institutions to offer programs on military bases contributed to the problems of base education officers who had to turn to out-of-state institutions. Some states opposed the entrance of out-of-state institutions even when the host state was unwilling to make programs available. One base was surrounded by three state colleges, none of which was providing significant educational services. These institutions sometimes justified their stance by maintaining that they disliked the competition of programs already on base.

2. Other Organizations or Agencies--Veterans' benefits for graduate education were used to a great extent by service personnel. The Veterans Administration itself has had little control over program monitoring, the exercise of this function legally devolving to appropriate state approval agencies, which devote only minor efforts to postsecondary education. It was found that additional VA personnel were needed in some locations to coordinate and counsel military students about VA benefits and procedures. Students were experiencing difficulty in determining and obtaining their VA benefits.

PART IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Conclusions

The major findings of the case study presented in the previous chapter and the synopsis of the eleven cases presented in Part III would appear to validate the first two basic assumptions as stated at the beginning of the project. These assumptions were:

1. Military personnel should be provided off-duty educational opportunities during their tour of duty for: (1) improving their value to the military service, (2) preparing for a future career upon return to civilian life, and (3) upgrading their own educational background.
2. On-base non-military education programs beyond the high-school level can best be offered by accredited postsecondary educational institutions.
3. The responsibility for the quality of postsecondary educational programs offered by institutions on military bases is a responsibility which is shared by the institution, the military, and the appropriate regional accrediting commission.

There continues to be a major opportunity for postsecondary educational institutions to provide degree programs and courses for the hundreds of thousands of military service personnel. The education offered needs to be of the highest quality and should provide enough variety for students to achieve one or more of the three basic goals stated in the first assumption. A review of the case-study reports prepared by the visiting committees shows substantial evidence of sincere attempts on the part of colleges and universities to provide the needed educational opportunities. Though in a number of institutions the quality of the programs and courses offered was questionable, this problem will be addressed with specific recommendations in this chapter.

Assumption two clearly states the belief that accredited institutions of the postsecondary education community are in the best position to offer college-level degree programs and courses on military installations for service personnel. This assumption was substantiated by the visiting committees; however, several serious qualifying factors need to be presented and discussed.

First, a basic premise needs to be stated and understood. Though many providers of postsecondary education have emerged in the United States, especially during the past decade, there is strong support, from both within and outside the educational community, that collegiate education is best when provided by professional educators working from the established and recognized colleges and universities. The experience of these institutions in the delivery of education, combined with their ability to select and assign mature faculty members to military organizations, can provide better quality programs. The basic questions are have they, and will they do so?

A second factor that must be addressed is the meaning of accredited status. At present, the fact that an institution was regionally accredited has primarily served as the "quality assurance factor." An understanding of what accreditation means is essential to understand the current situation concerning off-campus education offered on military installations by accredited colleges and universities. Generally, regional accreditation attests to the meeting of minimal standards or criteria by a college or university. Compliance is determined by a periodic review and evaluation made in the context of the institution's stated purpose, goals, and objectives. If an institution has had as a purpose the serving of military students at off-campus sites, its on-base programs probably have been evaluated in some form.

However, only recently have all of the regional accrediting commissions for postsecondary institutions developed specific standards or criteria and policies for frequent and regular review of off-campus operations, including military installations, for accreditation purposes. Previously the fact that an institution was regionally accredited did not necessarily mean that the institution was capable of delivering quality degrees and courses off campus. When the new policies and procedures have been fully implemented, reasonable assurance of such quality can be expected. Yet, some form of monitoring will always be needed to insure that actual performance equals institutional capability.

A third factor has been implied, if not openly suggested, by the critics of the current delivery of education on military installations by colleges and universities. Simply stated, it is the idea that traditional colleges and universities cannot deliver programs of the same or equivalent quality as those on the parent campus at remote sites. Further, critics contend that the greater the distance from the main campus location, the poorer is the quality of the programs offered. The contention follows that some other method should be devised for such programs.

The visiting committees did not find evidence to support this idea. While no scientific correlation study was made of the relationship of distance to program quality, it was the professional judgment of the on-site committees that, per se, there is no correlation of distance to quality. What the committees did find was that some of the factors related to quality--i.e., faculty and course approval by home campus units, program evaluation, and administrative direction--are more costly and sometimes complicated because of greater geographical distances. Committee members did not find that these and other quality assurance factors cannot be carried out in an appropriate and effective manner at on-base locations. In fact, programs of excellent quality were found operated at great distances from the parent institution.

The case-study findings and visiting committees strongly support the proposition of assumption three that the responsibility for quality assurance of educational programs offered by colleges and universities should be shared equally by the institutions involved, the military, and the regional accrediting commissions. However, it was found that the parties concerned are not currently working cooperatively or aggressively for the assurance of quality of military base programs. Fully shared responsibility for quality, in practice, will mean a greater role for the military in the administration of its educational enterprise and a more active role for the accrediting associations in the review and evaluation of these programs and courses.

Postsecondary institutions operating off-campus degree programs and courses on military installations have the responsibility to offer educational programs of the highest quality for military personnel. The quality assurance system of the main campus must accept that responsibility before courses are offered. Course and program content, the depth and breadth of the educational experience, and the faculty instructional expertise must be adequate for the level of courses and degrees to be offered. It is also the institution's responsibility to see that the necessary library and other learning resources are available and readily accessible.

The responsibilities of the military are more complex because of the organizational structure and diversity that exists among and within the military and its various branches. The office of the secretary of defense has the major responsibility for setting and implementing educational policy and priority for all of the services to insure consistency and equity of educational opportunity. In accordance with this DOD policy, each branch of service has the responsibility to operate the educational program for its constituents with command support at all levels and appropriate assistance at each military installation involved. Financial support, facilities, library and learning resources, and personnel are critical areas for priority commitments if the military is to fulfill its responsibility in the quality assessment and assurance of on-base educational degree programs and courses.

Regional accrediting commissions have a major share of the responsibility for quality assessment. Determination that an institution has the capability to deliver and maintain degree programs and courses of acceptable quality in off-campus settings is directly related to the accreditation process and is part of an institution's accredited status. The accrediting associations must adapt their normal evaluation processes for a regular and more frequent review of military-base educational programs.

Other agencies and organizations that have an important role to play in the educational enterprise for the military are the state approval and licensing bodies and the Veterans Administration. Specific recommendations concerning the role of these agencies are discussed in the next section of the report.

General Recommendations

The recommendations growing out of the case study fall into two categories: general recommendations, dealing primarily at the policy level, and specific recommendations for educational institutions, the military, accrediting associations, and others such as the states and the Veterans Administration.

1. Because citizens who make up the United States Armed Forces are entitled to and deserving of postsecondary educational opportunities equal to those available to civilian students through accredited colleges and universities, it is recommended that such institutions provide appropriate degree programs and courses, in so far as such activity is consistent with the institution's purpose and mission and is supported by academic strengths and resources sufficient to deliver and maintain programs of high quality.

2. To achieve high quality and consistency in educational programs offered on military installations by colleges and universities, it is recommended that the policy proposed in Part V of this report be implemented by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation in conjunction with the other organizations and agencies involved.

Specific Recommendations

Educational Institutions

The information and data produced in the case study concerning the operations of the accredited colleges and universities involved in postsecondary education for service personnel offered on military installations has led to a number of specific recommendations.

1. Commitment to Serving Military Education--By the act of providing postsecondary education to service personnel on a military installation, an institution has as a part of its purpose and mission, in statement and fact, a commitment to serve the military student. Such a commitment requires the allocation of appropriate institutional resources--including administrative and faculty personnel, learning resources, and financial support--to provide program stability and continuity and to assure the integrity and quality of the degree programs and courses offered. The short- and long-range plans for the institution must reflect and clearly define the role that on-base education plays in the present and future educational mission of the institution.

2. Organizational Relationships--In fulfilling its commitment to military-base education, an institution must develop and implement adequate and appropriate administrative, academic, and organizational relationships between the home campus and the off-campus site to assure the integrity and quality of the academic program offered. These relationships

shall be such as to assure regular and frequent contact between administrative and academic personnel at the parent campus and on-base institutional personnel. Operational decisions concerning such matters as admissions and graduation requirements, qualifications and approval of all personnel (full- and part-time faculty and administrators), curriculum and course content, and program evaluation shall involve the home campus. Part-time or adjunct instructors and full-time instructors without on-campus teaching experience shall have an on-campus orientation to the instructional expectations of the institution involved, and shall have regular and frequent contact with appropriate academic personnel from the parent campus.

3. Resource Allocation--Any institution involved in military-base education shall have and must allocate support resources adequate to assure the integrity and quality of the programs and courses offered. The principle of "fulfilling the educational mission" of the institution should rule. Tuition and fees for programs offered should be directly related to institutional costs.

4. Instructional Programs--On-base instructional programs shall meet all criteria and standards normally required at the parent campus and shall be in keeping with nationally accepted practices for specified fields of study and particular degree levels and designations.

All degree programs offered on military installations shall be so designed, sequenced, and cohesive in nature as to provide educational experiences of integrity and academic quality for service personnel. Where appropriate curricular requirements for the depth and breadth of the educational experience cannot be provided, the program should not be offered.

An institution must determine the aptitudes and achievement levels of prospective students, the special requirements of military life, and the kinds of delivery systems possible in a military setting before offering degree programs and courses on a military base. New and appropriate teaching strategies consonant with interrupted learning, basic-skill deficiencies, adult learners, socio-cultural disadvantage, and other factors must be created when necessary.

5. Student Services--An institution offering military-base education shall provide student services appropriate to the particular needs of the military student. Such services must include a comprehensive program of academic counseling by qualified professionals for military personnel enrolled in on-base educational programs.

6. Library/Learning Resources--The institution involved shall accept full responsibility for assuring the provision of adequate and readily accessible learning resources to support its programs offered on military installations. Close coordination with home-campus learning resources as well as cooperation

with base libraries, other institutions operating on the base, and local learning resources near the site is essential for an effective program.

7. Physical Facilities--An institution should not accept inadequate, inappropriate, or poorly equipped facilities for on-base instruction. While the quality of the educational experience is more directly related to the quality of the faculty and the ability of the student, an adequate physical environment conducive to learning is also essential.

8. Faculty--An institution offering degree programs and courses on a military base must provide the following: (1) an adequate core of full-time faculty members with appropriate academic credentials for the curriculum offered, who are experienced in teaching campus-based programs and who can bring depth and breadth to the educational experience of the military student; (2) consistency and stability in curricular and course content; and (3) adequate opportunity for intellectual exchange between students and faculty members.

9. Graduate Programs--Graduate degree programs and courses shall not be offered on military installations by an institution unless it can clearly demonstrate that all of the essential elements are available and in place for the delivery of quality graduate education. These elements include senior faculty with appropriate qualifications; adequate library and other learning resources, including specialized research

materials and equipment necessary to the curriculum; and a schedule that allows sufficient time for an indepth educational experience involving review and research of the literature and regular and frequent discourse with experienced graduate faculty and other graduate students.

Degree programs beyond the master's shall not be offered except in unusual circumstances.

10. Quality Assurance--Quality assurance processes used on the home campus shall apply equally to on-base degree programs and courses. Additional policies and procedures for quality control and assurance may also be required.

Quality assurance processes for on-base activities shall include at least the following:

- Admission and graduation requirements comparable to those for the same or similar programs at the home campus.
- Common policies and procedures for awarding credits for prior learning with those of the home campus.
- Common qualifications for on-base administrative and faculty personnel, full or part time, with those for the home campus in the same or similar positions.
- Common requirements for degree programs and courses (reading, projects, research, writings, and evaluations) with the same or similar programs and courses on the home campus.
- Approval by the home campus academic processes (departments, faculty committees, graduate councils, deans, etc.) of on-base academic matters such as degree programs and courses to be offered, faculty appointments, admissions standards, degree program and course requirements, the awarding of credits for prior learning, and methods for evaluation of student accomplishments and program effectiveness.

- Regular and systematic evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of the on-base military education programs and courses using the home campus and outside peer evaluators.

11. Service Opportunity--An institution offering degree programs and courses on military installations for service personnel should consider this activity as an exceptional opportunity for service and should exercise utmost care to provide education of the highest quality. In every way possible, institutions serving military students should work cooperatively with one another and avoid unnecessary duplication and competitiveness.

Military Organizations

The interest of military officials in providing postsecondary educational opportunities for its personnel has significantly increased since the advent of the all-volunteer armed services. While the offer of further education to recruits is one attraction to men and women for a military career, it is not the only reason why the military has increased its emphasis on education. Another motivation is the need for better-educated service personnel in general to carry out complex tasks involving today's sophisticated technologies. In the case study several factors essential to strengthening and improving educational opportunities for service personnel were identified in the area of responsibility of the military.

Specific recommendations are as follows:

1. Commitment to Education--The office of the secretary of defense must review and, where necessary, strengthen its commitment to providing quality educational opportunities to military personnel by clearly defining the role and purposes of postsecondary education. Such a statement of purpose should clearly delineate the DOD policy for and commitment to education for the military in general and should provide the framework for a consistent educational program. Appropriate flexibility should exist in order for each branch of military service and each command to pursue the achievement of the objectives established by the Department of Defense. The concept of commitment, priority, and operational authority are essential and must be fully defined by the DOD.

2. Organizational Relationships--the office of the secretary of defense and each branch of the service should review and redefine their organizational structures for education to achieve more uniform and consistent structures and, thus, provide a more effective educational program for military service personnel. Current organizational structures for education within the military establishment are too confusing and cumbersome to allow effective planning, program stability, and cooperative ventures among neighboring bases of the same or different branches of the military.

3. Resources Allocations--In accordance with the level of commitment to education by the Department of Defense and the various branches of the military, adequate financial and other resources must be allocated to support quality degree programs and courses. Resources would include tuition assistance for the military student; physical facilities and equipment; educational service office support staff, materials, and equipment; and library/learning resources, including adequate professionally trained staff for collection development and services.

A uniform funding-support plan is needed for resource allocation. It should be based on a cost-effective analysis done cooperatively with the institutions involved.

4. Instructional Program--Operating within policies established by the office of the secretary of defense, the various branches of the military should work cooperatively with postsecondary institutions to develop and maintain short- and long-range plans for educational programs and courses to be provided on military installations to meet the educational goals of the military and the military student. At the same time, it must be recognized that the final determination on degree programs and courses, admissions, completion requirements, transfer of credits, and curriculum content is the sole prerogative of the institution involved in accord with recognized good practices in the academic community.

5. Procuring of Educational Programs--The office of the secretary of defense should review and revise the current practices for procuring the services of educational institutions to provide programs on military installations. A sophisticated approach based on an assessment of the educational needs of personnel is needed for all branches of the military. Such a system must be fair and equitable and must treat the institutions as equal partners in the military educational enterprise. Competitive bidding on price alone must be discontinued. Also, such a system needs to encourage partnerships between bases and local institutions.

6. Quality Assurance--The office of the secretary of defense should develop a system to help assure the quality of educational programs on military bases.

Such a system should include at least the following:

- Verification with the appropriate regional accrediting commission that an institution has the capability--and the commission's approval--to deliver quality, off-campus degree programs and courses on military installations should be required before a program is established. Such verification should also require regular, on-site evaluations by the appropriate accrediting commission.

- Specific criteria and standards must be established for civilian and military personnel assigned to the educational service offices on military installations. Such individuals should possess appropriate educational degrees and should have had on-campus experience related to the tasks to be performed. Training programs and internships should be established with postsecondary institutions for base educational personnel and must be required of those who have not had on-campus experience but who are otherwise qualified.

- A comprehensive career and personal counseling program for service personnel interested in education should be provided by qualified professional counselors.
- Planning and evaluation of the military installation's total educational enterprise should be done systematically and regularly by the ESO in cooperation with the institutions involved. There should be periodic external review by educational peers. Base commanders should be appropriately involved in the planning and evaluation process.

Accrediting Commissions

Since the early 1900s, voluntary regional accrediting associations have verified educational quality by a process of peer review and evaluation that assures that an institution is in compliance with specified minimum standards or criteria. The role of regional accrediting associations has been to evaluate and accredit institutions as a whole, while specialized accrediting agencies evaluate and accredit particular components and programs.

Until recent years only a few regionally accredited institutions delivered their educational programs off campus. Therefore, little attention was given in the accreditation process to off-campus sites, including military base operations. With the advent of extensive off-campus degree programs and courses, the regional accrediting associations have recently developed new policies and procedures to include these operations in the accreditation process. In the future, off-campus degree programs and courses of accredited institutions offered on military installations must be reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis.

Because the regional accrediting commissions have an essential role to play in assuring the quality of military-base education, the following specific recommendations are made concerning their area of responsibility:

1. Institutional Capability--The regional accrediting commissions for postsecondary institutions must use the accreditation process to verify that an institution has the capability to deliver high quality degree programs and courses in off-campus settings such as military installations.

2. Evaluation of Military-Base Education--Regional commissions must include the evaluation of military-base educational programs in the regular self-study and review process for accredited institutions. Furthermore, because on-base programs change quickly and service personnel move frequently, accreditation reviews of on-base activities must be made more frequently than is normal for on-campus programs. This process should include regular visits to the parent campus to assure that the necessary administrative and academic procedures are being adequately and properly applied to military-base programs.

The evaluation of military-base education must verify the quality of the educational program through an assessment of program depth, student achievements, faculty and administrative qualification, adequacy of learning resources and the educational environment, acceptability of admissions and degree-completion requirements, and financial stability and integrity.

If a program is the first offering of an institution on a particular base, it must be evaluated in the first year of its operation to incorporate the new programs into the institution's accreditation. In the case of an institution's initial involvement in on-base military education, the parent campus must also be visited to evaluate the quality assurance processes as they apply to military-base education.

3. The Case-Study Model--When appropriate, the case-study model developed and used in this study should be applied by the regional accrediting commissions to achieve a holistic review and evaluation of military-base educational programs.

Other Organizations and Agencies

The Veterans Administration and state licensing authorities and higher education coordinating agencies have important functions to perform in the military-education enterprise.

The Veterans Administration, through its program of financial assistance to current and former service men and women, provides a significant percentage of the educational dollars spent by the federal government on education for military personnel. The VA has a legitimate concern that the monies allocated are properly spent on quality programs.

The state licensing authorities and higher education coordinating agencies have the right to approve and authorize institutions to operate within their territory. They also have the responsibility to provide appropriate support for the education of their citizens.

The following recommendations are made in an effort to define more clearly the roles and responsibilities of the Veterans Administration and the states in military-base education:

1. The Veterans Administration--The Veterans Administration must clearly inform current and former service personnel about available programs and the procedures for securing financial assistance for education. Regular and easily accessible assistance and counseling by qualified people should be provided to military personnel using VA educational benefits.

The Veterans Administration should rely on the accrediting associations to assure educational quality and on state agencies to verify institutional legitimacy.

2. The States--State authorities should encourage public and private institutions within their jurisdictions to provide on-base educational programs and courses. States, also, should work cooperatively with accrediting associations to verify educational quality and where possible avoid unnecessary duplication of effort in the evaluation process.

Areas for Further Study and Work

One of the outcomes expected from the case study was the development of a model for the evaluation of educational programs offered on military installations. Based on the results of the eleven separate studies made, it appears that the case-study method has been effective in reviewing and assessing the total postsecondary educational program of individual military installations. Each future use of the model used here should, of course, include careful study and analysis to refine and improve the model.

Another outcome anticipated from the study was the development of a standardized data-base system. While the information supplied by the participants was generally adequate for this project, further study and work is needed to develop a useful, standardized system of essential quantitative elements that should be present for the effective delivery of quality education programs on military bases. A copy of the data form used in the case study may be found in Appendix C, Part 2.

Another area identified for future study is the need to develop a reliable way to document and compare student achievement in on-campus programs and off-campus, military-base programs. Such a study would be valuable to institutions, the military, and accrediting associations in future assessments of postsecondary education for military students.

Though the case study did not find a need for separate criteria and standards for military-base education, further study in that area is appropriate because of the changing nature of the military educational enterprise. The accrediting agencies must be sure that they maintain standards or criteria and evaluation procedures adequate to assess military-base education.

PART V: PROPOSED NATIONAL POLICY

A major finding of the case study is the need for a single national policy to provide for consistent delivery of high-quality, postsecondary educational programs and courses on military installations. Though there should be flexibility in the delivery of programs, the need for consistency is paramount because of the complexity of the situation: the variety of institutions involved, the diversity among and within the military services, the differences among the six regional accrediting associations, and the individuality of licensing procedures and higher education coordination in the 50 states.

The policy should clearly define the roles, relationships, and responsibilities of all parties involved. Though the situation has not yet reached a chaotic state, the potential for chaos is there unless a national policy is mutually agreed upon by all of the major partners.

Attempts at such a policy have been made in the past by various groups and individuals, including the former Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education in 1973 (see Appendix G) and the Education Commission of the States' Task Force on State, Institutional, and Federal Responsibilities in Providing Postsecondary Educational Opportunity to Service Personnel in January, 1977. Individuals who have written on this subject include Kenneth H. Ashworth, commissioner of higher education in Texas, and Stephen K. Bailey, professor of education and social policy, Harvard University. Also the recently completed COPA study Assessing Nontraditional Education (1978) has relevant information for off-campus, on-base, postsecondary education.

All of these studies, reports, and writings have been taken into consideration, along with the current findings of this study, in proposing the national policy statement that follows.

Concept Statement

Personnel serving in the United States military are individuals who by their own choice have dedicated themselves to national security. As citizens in uniform they are entitled to and deserving of postsecondary educational opportunities comparable to those available to the civilian population. Such programs and courses should be of the highest quality and as varied in number of disciplines and career areas as the limitations of on-base delivery will permit. The postsecondary degree programs and courses should be provided by accredited colleges and universities capable of such activities.

The operation of an educational center on a military installation is a responsibility to be shared by the institutions involved, the military--including its various parts--the regional accrediting associations, the Veterans Administration, and the states. Coordination of efforts and cooperation among the various partners involved are essential for the devlopment and implementation of a total educational program of quality for military personnel.

Role and Responsibility of Institutions

Postsecondary institutions are encouraged to cooperate with the military in providing degree programs and courses that can be delivered in an on-base setting without diminishing their quality and depth. Institutions must recognize the unique circumstances of the military student and, where possible, adapt traditional methods and procedures to accommodate military personnel without sacrificing the quality of content or depreciating the meaning of the degree offered.

Institutions offering degree programs and courses on military installations have the responsibility to:

1. Provide only those programs and courses that are related to their institutional purpose and mission and for which they have the necessary resources (faculty, learning materials, and administrative personnel) to meet standards and criteria normally expected by the appropriate discipline or field of study.

2. Provide adequate full-time administrative personnel and services to assure the effective delivery of on-base programs and courses and provide regular and frequent contact with administrative and academic personnel on the parent campus.

3. Provide adequate on-base student services to assist military students in matters of admissions, transfer and evaluation of previous education, degree requirements, and specific program academic counseling.

4. Provide on-base faculty of acceptable experience, preparation and quality. The instructional staff must include full-time faculty with campus-based experience, supplemented with competent part-time instructors who are qualified in the field to be assigned and who are approved by the appropriate academic personnel on the parent campus.

5. Provide library materials and other learning resources necessary to assure the quality and depth of the learning experience according to institutional standards and those normally expected for the field of study and the degree offered.

6. Set tuition and fees based on actual institutional costs in order to support adequately the delivery of programs and courses of the highest quality.

7. Provide on-campus specially scheduled programs for military personnel, where proximity permits.

Role and Responsibility of the Military

In order to provide postsecondary educational opportunities of high quality for service personnel, the commitment to military-base education must be clearly articulated and given high priority by the U. S. Department of Defense through policies and regulations governing all service branches. These policies and regulations must provide for consistency in operations and support at each command level among and within the services.

Operational guidelines must provide for consistent and adequate on-base administrative practices concerning needs assessment, organizational structure and operations, the securing of institutional services, financial assistance, space allocations, equipment and supply needs, learning resources, and educational service office personnel and functions.

The military educational enterprise should be considered holistically and as a cooperative venture with institutions, accrediting agencies, the Veterans Administration, and the states. Programs should be established only after appropriate planning by representatives of all the aforementioned parties.

Role and Responsibility of Accrediting Agencies

Quality assurance of any educational program offered on a military installation is the responsibility of the regional accrediting commission that accredits the parent institution. The commission must make regular and frequent on-site evaluations of programs and courses offered by an accredited institution. Such evaluations are to be made not only at the time of the parent institution's regular self-study and evaluation, but also during the first year of operation of such programs and at regular intervals based on significant program and course change.

When appropriate, joint case studies are to be made by the regional accrediting commissions to evaluate the total educational program of a base as well as the programs and courses of individual institutions.

Role and Responsibility of the States

Each state has a responsibility to include on-base education in its planning process and to encourage state institutions to meet the educational needs of military personnel. Through authorization and licensing functions, each state is responsible for seeing that all institutions offering educational programs on military bases within that state are in compliance with state requirements. Each state also has a responsibility to assist the military student, when appropriate, with tuition assistance and to make available state learning resources (e.g., faculty, library, equipment) to on-base military educational centers.

The states should work cooperatively with the accrediting agencies in on-site evaluations for quality assurance.

Role and Responsibility of the Veterans Administration

As the major source of tuition assistance to former and present military personnel, the Veterans Administration has the responsibility to provide adequate and readily accessible counseling about benefits and timely processing of applications for benefits. To avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, the VA should work cooperatively with the military, the institutions, the accrediting associations, and the states to determine program quality for the approval of educational benefits for service personnel.

Implementation

This proposed national policy should be reviewed by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation through a task force which includes representatives of institutions operating on military bases; institutions not presently operating on military bases; the military, including the office of the secretary of defense, the various services, and base personnel; accrediting commissions; the states, including both licensing and coordinating agencies; the Veterans Administration; and representatives of the public.

The implementation of the policy must be based on approval by all of the parties involved including the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the U. S. Department of Defense (for the military), the regional accrediting commissions, the state higher education executive officers, and the Veterans Administration.

After such approval, any institution wishing to offer postsecondary education on a military installation will be expected to operate its programs in compliance with the policy.

REFERENCES

Andrews, Grover J. Assessing Nontraditional Education: Summary Report of the Project to Develop Evaluative Criteria and Procedures for the Accreditation of Nontraditional Education. Washington, D. C.: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1978.

Ashworth, Kenneth H. American Higher Education in Decline. College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 1979.

________, and Lindley, William G. "The Disgrace of Military Base Programs." Change, February 1977, p. 8.

Bailey, Stephen K. Academic Quality Control: The Case of College Programs on Military Bases. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Edwards, Edwin. Final Report and Recommendations: Task Force On State, Institutional, and Federal Responsibilities in Providing Postsecondary Educational Opportunity to Service Personnel. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1977.

"Postsecondary Educational Programs Conducted by Accredited or Candidate Institutions on Military Bases." Policy statement of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education, 1973.

Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges Directory, 1979. Washington, D.C.: Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges, 1979.

Trotter, James D. "The Development and Implementation of an Institutional Self-Study Process for the Military Base Program at Saint Leo College." Ph.D. research project, Nova University, 1979.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Advisory Committee

Appendix A

Advisory Committee

Mr. Gordon W. Sweet, Chairman
Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Dr. Robert Kirkwood, Executive Director
Commission on Higher Education
Midde States Association of Colleges and Schools

Dr. William J. MacLeod, Director of Evaluation
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
New England Association of Schools and Colleges

Dr. Daniel S. Maloney, Director of Evaluation
Commission on Vocational, Technical, Career Institutions
New England Association of Schools and Colleges

Dr. Thurston E. Manning, Director
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

Dr. James F. Bemis, Executive Director
Commission on Colleges
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges

Dr. B. E. Childers, Executive Secretary
Commission on Occupational Education Institutions
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Dr. Kay J. Andersen, Executive Director
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Dr. Robert E. Swenson, Executive Director
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Dr. Kenneth E. Young, President
The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

Department of Defense	Dr. Gerald B. Kauvar Special Assistant for Education Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics) Room 3B-922, The Pentagon Washington, DC 20301
	Major W. S. Sellman, Staff Specialist/Voluntary Education Programs Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics) Room 3B-922, The Pentagon Washington, DC 20301
U. S. Air Force	Mr. Robert Quick HQ USAF/MPPE Room 4C-240 The Pentagon Washington, DC 20330
U. S. Army	Mr. Tilton Davis HQ Department of the Army (DAAG-ED) Hoffman Building #1, Room 1434 2461 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22322
U. S. Marine Corps	Lt. Col. John Keenan, USMC c/o Commandant U. S. Marine Corps HQ U.S. Marine Corps Code OTTE Washington, DC 20380
U. S. Navy	Dr. Frances Kelly Office of the Chief of Naval Operations OP-114E Room 2833 Navy Annex Arlington, Virginia 20370
Staff	Jack Allen Grover Andrews

APPENDIX B

Prospectus

FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES

PROSPECTUS FOR

A CASE STUDY OF OFF-CAMPUS POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION ON MILITARY BASES

to be conducted for the
U. S. Department of Defense

by

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

and the

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
New England Association of Schools and Colleges
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

June, 1978

I. INTRODUCTION--Background and Rationale

The increasing desire of the United States military services to provide educational opportunities for their personnel has been met in recent years by a corresponding willingness on the part of civilian postsecondary educational institutions to extend their programs to military installations on the local, national, and international level. Recognizing the obvious need for programs of this type, regional accrediting commissions have encouraged institutions to cooperate with military services in providing appropriate undergraduate and graduate courses. It is assumed that educational needs and purposes may vary considerably from base to base. Courses may provide educational experiences which: (1) contribute to increased effectiveness in a present or future military occupation, (2) provide skills for a second career, and (3) are primarily for personal enrichment. In the process of meeting these varying needs institutions have modified considerably the traditional concept of campus residence, the physical setting, and the usual methods of credit accumulation in order to develop programs which serve the nontraditional student including the active off-duty serviceman. Those courses designed for the student in a college campus may not be appropriate for military personnel in terms of their past experience and present and future needs.

The availability of these educational opportunities has become a major recruitment tool of the military services and if some projections of manpower needs for volunteers are met, perhaps as many as one-third of this country's high school graduates may receive their first exposure to postsecondary education while in the military. Some military bases have already become major educational centers both in terms of range of programs, numbers of students, and variety and number of postsecondary institutions involved. In some instances up to 14 institutions have provided courses on a single base.

The responsibility for programs on military bases rests both with appropriate military officers and with the institution. It is recognized that there must be mutual understanding as to the objectives and needs of the military authorities as they relate to those of the institution providing educational experiences. Both of the parties to this educational endeavor are also concerned with program quality, as are accrediting commissions and the Veterans Administration, which estimates that about 250,000 military personnel on active duty currently use their VA benefits before discharge.

It has been assumed that regionally accredited institutions were offering quality programs on military bases, but in recent years some educators and the regional accrediting commissions themselves have expressed concern as to whether the quality and effectiveness of base programs has been adequately evaluated, especially since the expansion of some programs to locations thousands of miles from the parent institution. Military services, for their part, have a difficult task determining the holistic value of programs because of the present piecemeal evaluation of individual programs by accrediting agencies and the lapse of time before all programs are evaluated. Furthermore, program approval by state agencies has been uneven due to the geographical extent of the operations and because the programs are provided on federal installations. Contributing also to the problem of putting base programs in perspective is the decentralized nature of military education which, in some services, leaves program development primarily to base authorities. Base commanders, education officers, the military services, and the Department of Defense find it difficult to compare the quality of their programs, except in numbers of students and courses, with those of other bases having similar characteristics.

In short, these developments have made appropriate an in-depth study of the quality of postsecondary degree granting programs on military bases which offer a variety of programs involving a significant number of institutions. This study is vitally needed to provide a total picture of the state of the art at one point in time and to formulate recommendations which will enable the military, the institutions, and the accrediting agencies to re-examine present procedures and to plan for improvements in policy and program implementation.

The study is to be conducted by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the six regional accrediting associations for the Department of Defense using the case study method with on-site committees of peer evaluators visiting selected military installations.

II. THE CASE STUDY APPROACH

A. Purposes, Goals, Objectives

1. Basic Assumptions

a. Military personnel should be provided off-duty educational opportunities during their tour of duty for: (1) improving their value to the military service, (2) preparing for a future career upon return to civilian life, and (3) upgrading their own educational background.

b. On-base non-military educational programs beyond the high school level can best be offered by accredited postsecondary educational institutions.

c. The responsibility for the quality of postsecondary educational programs offered by institutions on military bases is shared by the institution, the military, and the appropriate regional accrediting commissions.

2. The Case Study Method

The Case Study Method is proposed in order to achieve the various goals developed for the project. These goals and purposes are as follows:

a. To make an assessment of postsecondary degree-granting programs offered by regionally accredited institutions on military bases.

b. To evaluate the effectiveness of civilian postsecondary educational institutions in the delivery of degree programs for personnel on selected military bases.

c. To identify the current roles of: (1) postsecondary institutions, (2) military organizations and personnel, (3) the states, (4) regional accrediting commissions, and (5) other organizations or agencies involved in the provision of on-base postsecondary educational programs by civilian institutions.

d. To identify and make recommendations concerning the functions essential for an on-going system of quality control in on-base postsecondary educational programs provided by civilian institutions.

e. To make recommendations concerning the proper roles to be performed by each of the participating organizations identified in c. above.

f. To provide a reservoir of data about postsecondary educational programs provided for military bases by civilian institutions for use by the military (base commanders, educational service officers, and Department of Defense personnel), institutional personnel, and accrediting commissions in the development of appropriate policies and procedures for such programs.

3. Case Study Prospectus

An institution serving a military base selected to participate in the case study will be expected to complete a comprehensive case study report. This description and analysis of the educational programs on a base is to include the following topics:

a. Administrative Organization
b. Curriculum
c. Advanced Placement Policy and Procedures
d. Faculty and Staff
e. Evaluation Systems
f. On-base Quality Control Systems of the Parent Institutions
g. Equipment and Facilities On-base.

B. The Plan

Working under the direction of an advisory committee composed of the executive officers of the nine regional accrediting commissions, a COPA representative, service representatives, and a Department of Defense representative, a Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases will be conducted during 1978 to determine the effectiveness of postsecondary institutions in providing degree programs on military installations. (See Appendix A)

Ten bases representative of the various branches of the military will be selected which provide a variety of institutions and education programs for use in the case study. A Case Study Report will be prepared for each base included in the study. The accrediting commission(s) operating in the geographical location of the base will have primary responsibility for the on-site visit and evaluation of the non-military postsecondary educational program of the military installation. The base commander will be responsible for host arrangements.

The complete report of the Visiting Committee will be transmitted to the accrediting commissions and to appropriate institutional and military personnel. The advisory committee for the project will receive all reports and issue a single evaluation report for the project to include appropriate recommendations at the national level concerning non-military postsecondary education on military installations.

1. Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Each postsecondary education institution currently operating on one of the military installations participating in the Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases will be expected to prepare a pre-visit report that will include an inventory of current educational programs, administrative organization, curriculum, advanced placement policy and procedures, faculty and other personnel, evaluation systems, and quality control systems, and equipment and facilities on base and at the parent institution. In preparing the Case Study Report the institution should address the following questions and areas:

a. Institutional Purpose. Does the official statement of purpose of the institution clearly provide for the extension of the educational programs and resources to off-campus programs for military personnel on military installations?

b. Institutional Organization and Administration. Does the organizational and administrative structure of the institution adequately provide for good administration of the institution's off-campus programs on the military installation? Using charts, describe the administrative organization of the institution to clearly indicate the lines of responsibility for the administrative and academic functions of the institution in providing educational programs on military installations? Is the organization effective in providing adequately for the military programs? Identify, in terms of effect on the student's educational experience, any weaknesses that may exist. What measures are planned, if needed, to improve the institution's services for programs on military installations? Does that part of the military organizational structure responsible for educational programs on base have appropriate policies and procedures to facilitate institutional operations on base?

c. Institutional Educational Programs. On the forms provided, inventory the educational programs of the institution which are offered on the military installation selected for the case study. Also, list and give the location of all other off-campus programs offered on military bases. (Appendix B) Does the educational program relate to the purposes of the institution and the military? Demonstrate the ways in which the policies and procedures of admission, instructional methods and procedures, and quality of work required of students are carried out by the institution on military installations. In what ways do the admissions standards and criteria, both qualitative and quantitative, insure the admission of students who can benefit from the programs offered? What efforts are being made to improve and continually evaluate the programs?

(1) Admissions. Who is responsible for setting general admissions policy? Briefly describe the admissions policy and procedures for programs offered on military installations. Describe the institution's policy and procedures for evaluation and awarding of credits for prior learning (e.g., CLEP, transfer, civilian job experience, military service and schools, etc.) Determine if comprises have been made in admissions requirements in order to maintain adequate enrollments. Evaluate the admissions policies and procedures, identifying weaknesses and strengths. Does the subsequent educational record of students validate the

admissions process in terms of selecting students whose chances are good of satisfactorily completing the program? What efforts are being made to improve admissions?

(2) Curriculum. Describe the process by which the curriculum is reviewed and established. Indicate who is responsible for the final determination of curriculum policy. In what ways are the administration, faculty and military involved in the development of academic programs and in the procedures for curricular change? How does the institution evaluate each program and its results? In evaluating each program offered demonstrate that it contains sufficient advanced-level work in the subject field to be consistent with similar on-campus degree programs. Evaluate the effectiveness of the institution's policies and procedures in providing and maintaining educational programs of quality for military personnel. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and propose solutions for problem areas that may be identified.

(3) Instruction. Are methods of instruction related to the objectives of the course, the capabilities of the students, and the institution's standards of quality? Show how the evaluation of student performance supports the institution's concern for quality and integrity and discriminates adequately among levels of student performance. Examine grade distributions in the courses offered in military programs over the past year. By what means are the quality and effectiveness of instruction regularly evaluated? How is evaluation of instruction related to subject matter, course objectives, and programs of study? Is the effectiveness of instruction under continuous study? How is the quality of instruction on military installations related to the quality control system of the institution on the home campus? Identify strengths and weaknesses in the instructional component of the institution's educational programs offered on military installations. What solutions are proposed for problem areas that may be identified? Where graduate programs are offered, what measures have been taken to insure the quality, level, and integrity of the graduate experience for the military student?

(4) Learning Resources and Physical Facilities. Briefly describe the learning resources and physical facilities that are available on the military installation to support the educational programs of the institution. What measures have the institution and the military authorities taken to supplement these learning resources? Evaluate the adequacy of the learning resources to support the programs offered. What additional learning resources and physical facilities are needed? How may these be provided?

(5) Student Services. Briefly describe the student services that are available for military installations? How are academic advisement and personal counseling needs of students met? Have these services been evaluated and are they adequate? What additional services are needed? How may they be provided? What are the roles of the institutions and the military in the coordination of program and student services? Is this coordination effective?

(6) Financial Resources. Briefly describe the financial arrangements in support of the educational programs offered on the base. Using charts present the financial history of the on-base programs showing sources of income, expenditures, and allocation of excess of income over expenditures by the institution. Are the programs adequately supported? What changes are proposed in the financing of the on-base programs? How do income and costs for on-base programs compare with those on campus?

2. Accrediting Commission

The accrediting commission(s) responsible for the region in which the military installation is located will have primary responsibility for the organization and conduct of the on-site committee evaluation of the postsecondary education program. All visits will be arranged and coordinated by the advisory committee for the Case Study.

a. Visiting Committee Structure. Each Visiting Committee should consist of at least the following personnel, most of whom should have had experience with military education:

Chairman (1)
Financial Officer (1)

Program Specialists (2 or more depending on programs offered)
Commission staff (1)
Observers:
  DOD
  Military Service
  Education personnel from other services may be invited
  State
  VA

b. Visiting Committee Responsibilities. Members of the Visiting Committee will recieve the Case Study Report and other materials prior to the visit. Before arriving at the base each member is to read the report and become familiar with its contents. Prior to the visit, each member of the committee will receive notice concerning the date of the visit, suggestions regarding transportation, housing, time of the first meeting, time of the final meeting, and a list of the committee personnel indicating individual assignments.

Definition of Roles--The committee is to give an opinion, based on their on-site evaluation, as to the appropriate roles in the development and delivery of on-base postsecondary education for:

1. The institutions
2. The military
3. The accrediting commissions
4. The states

In making the on-site visit the committee should use the following evaluation criteria:

General

1. The extent of the coincidence of base education purposes and objectives with those of the institutions which provide educational experiences.

2. Characteristics of students as related to admissions requirements, course content, and course procedures used to accommodate these characteristics.

Input Criteria

1. Administration

   a. How are institutions selected for on-base programs? How often do senior administrators from the parent institution visit the base? How is the program administered in relationship to the home institution? What are the responsibilities of institutional authorities vis a vis military authorities? Who determines financial arrangements?

   b. Who makes decisions on academic matters?

   c. How are educational priorities determined by military authorities? Are course selections compatible with the overall objectives of the base program and with those of the parent institution? How are decisions made regarding assignment of programs to the various institutions?

   d. Are student services coordinated to avoid duplication and to effect economies?

   e. Have the appropriate regional accrediting commissions been informed of new base programs by the institutions involved? How long has it been since the last evaluation? (on base)

2. Academic Program

   a. What are the academic and experiential qualifications of the faculty? What is the extent of the employment of adjunct instructors? Are there procedures for the monitoring of faculty performance?

   b. Is there faculty input into academic matters on military installations? Student input?

   c. Are there stated admissions policies? Do they vary from those of the parent institution?

   d. Is curriculum consistent with program objectives? What is the extent of non-credit offerings?

   e. Are there stated policies in regard to what is expected of students? Do students have the opportunity to evaluate instruction and their on-base educational program?

   f. What learning resources are available--library, audio-visual, etc. In what ways do they support the learning objectives of programs?

g. What physical facilities in terms of classrooms and laboratories are available? Are they adequate to support the programs offered?

h. What are the procedures for record keeping of student files?

Output Criteria

1. Are there formal procedures for evaluating the student outcomes of courses and programs in terms of stated objectives?

2. Are there provisions for recording the post-program attainments of graduates? Are the procedures similar to those employed at the home campus of the institution?

3. How much and what types of military education are accepted for credit toward degree programs? Are credits earned on base accepted by other institutions?

The Visiting Committee will make an evaluation of the postsecondary education program at the base with appropriate recommendations for the program as a whole as well as for the individual institutions and administrative units, both military and civilian.

c. Final Report. Before the committee leaves the base, the chairman is to obtain a rough draft of the written report from each member of the committee. The chairman will then prepare a draft of the full report to achieve consistency of presentation and submit copies to the appropriate institutional and military personnel to be checked for errors of fact and possible conclusions made on the basis of incomplete and/or inaccurate information. When the chairman judges the report to be correct, copies of the final report will be distributed to the chairman of the Case Study.

The Visiting Committee will give an oral report of their findings to the Base Commander and/or his representative, institutional representatives, and others before they leave the military installation.

3. Schedule

From time of approval to receipt of funds implementation will be as follows:

Two Months:

The advisory committee, working with the appropriate military personnel, will select the military installations to be included in the Case Study.

Six Months:

The visiting committees will make the on-site evaluations on a schedule of dates appropriate to the particular military installations.

Two Months:

The advisory committee for the Case Study will review all of the base reports and will prepare and present a final comprehensive report on the total Case Study of Postsecondary Education on Military Bases. The final report will include a summary of findings and conclusions with appropriate recommendations for the institutions, the military, and the regional accrediting commissions for the improvement of the effectiveness of the delivery of quality postsecondary education to military personnel on military installations.

4. Budget

The following budget is proposed for the Case Study evaluation:

Ten military installations--costs for each =		
Visiting committee personnel		
core committee of nine @ $500 =	$ 4,500	$6,000 average cost per visit
Administrative costs (preliminary visit, report preparation, advisory committee work)	1,500	
Costs for ten visits plus total project expenses:		$60,000

Observers will participate at their own expense.

APPENDIX C

Letters of Invitation with Enclosures

Part 1: Participating Base Commanders
Part 2: Participating Institutions
Part 3: Visiting Committee Members
Part 4: Document to Educational Services Representatives in the DOD

APPENDIX C - Part 1

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

Dear

Your military installation has been selected to participate in a Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases. This study is being conducted for the United States Department of Defense by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the postsecondary commissions of the six regional accrediting associations. The Department of Defense will fund the project through COPA to be administered through the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The Advisory Committee for this study consists of the president of COPA, the executive secretaries/directors of all the regional postsecondary accrediting commissions, representatives of each service branch, and a representative from the Department of Defense.

The Case Study is a serious attempt to gather information necessary to assess the nature and quality of degree programs being offered on military bases. Briefly the goals of the study are as follows:

1. To identify the current roles of:
    - (a) postsecondary institutions,
    - (b) military organizations and personnel,
    - (c) the states,
    - (d) regional accrediting commissions, and
    - (e) other organizations or agencies concerned with on-base postsecondary educational programs provided by civilian institutions.

2. To make recommendations concerning the proper roles of each of the organizations listed in 1. above.

3. To make recommendations for an on-going system of quality control in institutional programs provided on base.

4. To provide a reservoir of data about these postsecondary educational programs for use by the military (base commanders, educational service officers, and Department of Defense personnel), institutional

Kenneth E. Young, President / Eugene I. Van Antwerp, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate

One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 760, Washington, D. C. 20036 phone (202) 452-1433

personnel, and accrediting commissions in the development of appropriate policies and procedures for such programs.

The plan for the Case Study is as follows:

1. The following bases have been selected by the Case Study Advisory Committee to participate in the study:

	Installation	Dates (1979)
1.	MacDill Air Force Base, Florida	March 25-28
2.	Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, North Carolina Cherry Point Marine Corps Base, North Carolina	April 22-26
3.	Kadena Air Force Base, Okinawa Camp Butler Marine Corps Base, Okinawa Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska	May 1-11
4.	Naval Station, Mayport, Florida	May 6-9
5.	McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey	May 13-17
6.	Ft. Stewart Army Base, Georgia	May 13-17
7.	Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia Naval Guided Missile School, Dam Neck, Virginia Beach, Virginia Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Norfolk, Virginia Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia	May 20-25
8.	Ft. Carson Army Base, Colorado	June 3-7
9.	Naval Air Station, Miramar, San Diego, California Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California	June 3-7
10.	V Corps Installations, Frankfurt, W. Germany Rhein/Main Air Force Base Lindsey Air Station	June 23-July 3

2. Each institution offering postsecondary degree programs on one or more selected bases is being invited to complete a two-part report.

   Part One will consist of a list of all off-campus degree programs offered by the institution on military bases, indicating the scope of programs offered. Part Two will describe and analyze only those degree programs offered by the institution on bases selected for the Case Study. It will include the following:

   (a) administration and organization
   (b) programs and curricula
   (c) admission policy and procedures
   (d) faculty and staff
   (e) evaluation and quality control systems
   (f) effectiveness of instruction
   (g) equipment and facilities
   (h) student services

3. The institutional report will be furnished to visiting committees selected by the chairman of the Case Study Advisory Committee after consultation with representatives of each of the regional accrediting agencies. A committee will be appointed to visit each selected base, with a majority of the members representing the region in which the base is located and members from other regions as well. Each committee will include one or more regional commission staff members for the Case Study, and may also include a number of observers from such groups as the Department of Defense, service branches, state approval agencies, Veterans Administration, and the Office of Education.

4. When each of the selected bases is visited, institutions will be expected to have a representative present during the committee visit.

An integral part of the Case Study is the committee visit to your installation. This visit is scheduled for April 22-27, 1979. The regional accrediting commission whose area includes your base will have primary responsibility for the organization of the on-site visit. Visiting committee members will be furnished with copies of the individual institutional reports in advance of the visit. It is expected that arrangements regarding lodging and meals will be made by the DOD service representatives in conjunction with the base ESO. Transportation will be arranged by the chairman of the Advisory Committee in coordination with the staff of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

The visiting committee members will contribute to an evaluative report in light of institutional reports and the findings of the on-site visit. Before leaving the base the committee will present an oral report to the Base Commander and the institutional representatives. A draft of the full written report will be submitted by the chairman of the visiting committee to the appropriate institutional and military personnel in order to check for accuracy. Final reports will be sent to the chairman of the Advisory Committee. A Comprehensive Report on Military Base Education based on the various individual case study reports will be prepared by the Advisory Committee at the conclusion of the total project. This report will summarize findings and conclusions of the various installation reports and will make appropriate recommendations for the institutions, the military, and the regional accrediting commissions.

We are confident that this study will result in information and recommendations of significant value to the higher education community and to the military. We look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Gordon W. Sweet
Chairman of the Advisory Committee
Military Base Case Study
Southern Association of Colleges
and Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

GWS:el
cc: ESO

APPENDIX C - Part 2

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

Dear

This letter is being sent to invite the participation of your institution in an important study of educational programs which are currently being offered by accredited postsecondary institutions on military installations. The Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases will be conducted by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the postsecondary commissions of the six regional accrediting agencies for the United States Department of Defense. The Department of Defense will fund the project through COPA to be administered through the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The Advisory Committee for this study consists of the president of COPA, the executive secretaries/directors of all the regional postsecondary accrediting commissions, representatives of each service branch, and a representative from the Department of Defense.

The Case Study is a serious attempt to gather information necessary to assess the nature and quality of degree programs being offered on military bases. Briefly the goals of the study are as follows:

1. To identify the current roles of:
    (a) postsecondary institutions,
    (b) military organizations and personnel,
    (c) the states,
    (d) regional accrediting commissions, and
    (e) other organizations or agencies concerned with on-base postsecondary educational programs provided by civilian institutions.

2. To make recommendations concerning the proper roles of each of the organizations listed in 1. above.

3. To make recommendations for an on-going system of quality control in institutional programs provided on base.

Kenneth E. Young, President / Eugene I. Van Antwerp, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate

One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 760, Washington, D. C. 20036 phone (202) 452-1433

The plan for the Case Study is as follows:

1. The following bases have been selected by the Case Study Advisory Committee to participate in the study:

	Installation	Dates (1979)
1.	MacDill Air Force Base, Florida	March 25-28
2.	Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, North Carolina Cherry Point Marihe Corps Base, North Carolina	April 22-26
3.	Kadena Air Force Base, Okinawa Camp Butler Marine Corps Base, Okinawa Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska	May 1-11
4.	Naval Station, Mayport, Florida	May 6-9
5.	McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey	May 13-17
6.	Ft. Stewart Army Base, Georgia	July 14-17
7.	Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia Naval Guided Missile School, Dam Neck, Virginia Beach, Virginia Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Norfolk, Virginia Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia	May 20-25
8.	Ft. Carson Army Base, Colorado	June 3-7
9.	Naval Air Station, Miramar, San Diego, California Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California	June 3-7
10.	V Corps Installations, Frankfurt, W. Germany Rhein/Main Air Force Base Lindsey Air Station	June 23-July 3

2. Each institution offering postsecondary degree programs on one or more selected bases is being invited to complete a two-part report.

   Part One will consist of a list of all off-campus degree programs offered by the institution on military bases, indicating the scope of programs offered. Part Two will describe and analyze only those degree programs offered by the institution on bases selected for the Case Study. It will include the following:

   (a) administration and organization
   (b) programs and curricula
   (c) admission policy and procedures
   (d) faculty and staff
   (e) evaluation and quality control systems
   (f) effectiveness of instruction
   (g) equipment and facilities
   (h) student services

3. The institutional report will be furnished in advance to visiting committees selected by the chairman of the Case Study Advisory Committee after consultation with representatives of each of the regional accrediting commissions. A committee will be appointed to visit each selected base, with the majority of the members representing the region in which the base is located and members from other regions as well. Each committee will include one or more regional commission staff members for the Case Study, and may also include a number of observers from such groups as the Department of Defense, service branches, state approval agencies, Veterans Administration, and the Office of Education. No visits will be made to the home campuses of institutions.

4. When each of the selected bases is visited, institutions will be expected to have a representative present during the committee visit. The visiting committee members will each prepare an evaluative report in light of institutional reports, the base report, and the findings of the on-site visit. Before leaving the base the committee will present an oral report to the Base Commander and the institutional representatives. A draft of the full written report will be submitted by the chairman of the visiting committee to the appropriate institutional and military personnel in order to check for accuracy. Final reports will be sent to the chairman of the Advisory Committee.

> A Comprehensive Report on Military Base Education based on the various individual case study reports will be prepared by the Advisory Committee at the conclusion of the total project. This report will summarize findings and conclusions of the various installation reports and will make appropriate recommendations for the institutions, the military, and the regional accrediting commissions.

We are confident that this study will result in information and recommendations fo significant value to the higher education community and to the military. We earnestly solicit and look forward to your participation.

The institutional report forms are attached to this letter.

Would you please furnish us with the name, address and phone number of the institutional representative from the home campus who will be present for the base visit and also the name, address, and phone number of the representative handling your programs on the base.

Sincerely,

Gordon W. Sweet
Chairman of the Advisory Committee
Military Base Case Study
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges
and Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

GWS/el
Enclosure

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FOR THE CASE STUDY OF OFF-CAMPUS POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION ON MILITARY BASES

Introduction

Each postsecondary institution currently operating on one or more of the military installations participating in the Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases has been asked to prepare a report to be furnished to committees which will visit these bases. These reports will be furnished to members of the visiting committee to aid them in gaining an accurate picture of degree programs being offered on the selected bases and also on the scope of programs being offered by your institution on other bases. The institutional reports will be utilized in preparing reports which will be sent to the Advisory Committee for the Case Study. A final report reviewing all of the committee reports will then be produced by the Advisory Committee.

We emphasize that all of these reports are for informational purposes only and will not be used for purposes of accreditation. This is not an accreditation study.

The institutional report is organized in two parts. Part One is an inventory of programs to be used to describe off-campus units constituting the institution's total off-campus program on military installations. Part Two is a detailed report, part narrative and part statistical information, which concerns degree programs offered only on those bases selected for the Case Study. Part Two must be completed for each base selected for the Case Study (see cover letter) on which your institution offers degree programs.

It is recommended that the parent institution respond to the items in Part One and that representatives or those administrators responsible for off-campus units assist in responding to the items in Part Two.

Please respond on a separate document (not on this form).

In responding to the questions, please repeat the question prior to the response. Supplementary materials such as catalogs (campus and off-campus), policy manuals, and promotional literature should be submitted along with the responses to items included in this form.

Kenneth E. Young, President / Eugene I. Van Antwerp, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate

One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 760, Washington, D. C. 20036 phone (202) 452-1433

Send three copies of the completed report (Part One and Part Two for each selected base) and any supplementary materials to:

Gordon W. Sweet
Chairman of the Advisory Committee
Military Base Case Study
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30308

The three copies for each selected base should be received not later than two weeks prior to the date for the committee visit to that base.

PART ONE - TOTAL OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAM OF THE INSTITUTION ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A. Please show:

1. Date completed
2. Name of parent institution
3. Address
4. Telephone number
5. Name and title of respondent
6. Control (public, private non-profit, private-proprietary, church-related)

B. Please list the locations of all off-campus programs offered by the parent institution on military installations, list the degree programs offered at each location, and the enrollment in each program.

PART TWO - PROGRAMS AT EACH OFF-CAMPUS LOCATION SELECTED FOR INCLUSION IN THE MILITARY BASE CASE STUDY

Note: Complete this section for each location (military base) selected for the Case Study where your institution offers off-campus programs as listed in Part One.

A. Name of institution and home campus address

B. Location of this (these) program(s)

1. Name and address of chief administrative officer for this off-campus unit.

2. HEGIS programs offered on this base and total FTE enrollment for each.

3. Degree programs offered at this location, but not on the home campus.

4. Distance of base from the home campus.

5. By what organizations is the institution or its programs accredited?

6. Have the appropriate regional accrediting commissions been informed of new base programs? How long has it been since the last on-base evaluation?

C. Institutional goals and purposes

Does the official statement of purpose of the institution clearly provide for the extension of the educational resources to off-campus programs for military personnel on military installations?

D. Institutional organization and administration

1. How does the organizational and administrative structure provide for administration of the institution's off-campus programs?

Using charts, describe the administrative organization to clearly indicate the lines of responsibility for the administrative and academic functions in providing these programs. What are the responsibilities of institutional authorities vis-a-vis military authorities? How does the off-campus unit maintain contact with the home campus?

2. Identify in terms of effect on student educational experience, any weaknesses that may exist.

3. Does that part of the military organizational structure responsible for educational programs on this base have appropriate policies and procedures to facilitate institutional operations on base?

4. What measures are planned, if needed, to improve the institution's services for programs on this installation?

5. What was the procedure of the military in informing your institution of the desire for programs to be offered on this base?

E. Degree programs (If response to an item is identical for all programs on this base, please indicate. If not, please identify by program.)

   1. Does the program relate to both the purposes of the institution and the military?

   2. Admissions

      a. Who is responsible for setting the general admissions policy?

      b. Briefly describe the admissions policy and procedure.

      c. Describe the institution's policy and procedures for evaluation and awarding of credits for prior learning (CLEP, transfer, civilian job experience, military service and schools, etc.).

      d. Does the subsequent educational record of students validate the admissions process in terms of selecting students whose chances are good of satisfactorily completing the program?

      e. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the admissions policies and procedures?

F. Faculty

   1. Complete the attached roster of instructional staff for this off-campus unit.

2. How are faculty selected for programs on this base? Who does the selection (on-campus department head, dean, other)? Is an interview at the home campus required?

3. For each degree program offered on-base provide the following information.

   a. Total number of faculty (full-time and adjunct)

   b. Number of faculty with primary appointments on the home campus

   c. Percent of b. by category (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, other)

   d. Of b. number and percent holding terminal degrees

   e. Of b. number and percent holding formal waivers or equivalence

   f. Waivers and equivalencies approved by:
      Department head _________
      Dean _________
      President _________
      Board _________
      If none of the above, please explain

   g. Percent of b. assigned as overload _________
      Percent of b. assigned as part of load _________

   h. Number of faculty teaching more than one on-base course _________.

   i. Number of faculty with
      two courses _________
      three courses _________
      four courses _________

   j. Number of adjuncts

   k. Number and percent of adjuncts holding terminal degrees

   l. Number and percent of adjuncts holding formal waivers or equivalencies

m. Number of adjuncts with
two courses ______
three courses ______
four courses ______

n. Waivers and equivalencies approved by
Department head ______
Dean ______
President ______
Board ______
If none of the above, please explain.

o. Is attendance at on-campus faculty meetings required for

Full-time faculty Yes ____ No ____
Adjunct faculty Yes ____ No ____

p. Is attendance at base faculty meetings required for

Full-time faculty Yes ____ No ____
If yes, frequency of meetings per year ____

Adjunct faculty Yes ____ No ____
If yes, frequency of meetings per year ____

q. Is classroom observation formally conducted?
If yes, by whom?
Faculty peers from discipline ____
Faculty peers from outside discipline ____
Campus-based administrators ____
On-base institutional representatives ____
Military personnel ____

If yes, frequency of observation per year ____

r. Are faculty evaluation conferences required with
Department head ____
Dean ____
Military personnel ____

s. Participation in institutional governance, including
curriculum committees is required for
Full-time faculty ____
Adjunct faculty ____

t. Are formal evaluations of faculty by students
conducted? If yes, submit form.

u. Number of required on-base office hours per credit hour of instruction

0.0 ____
0.25 ____
0.5 ____
0.75 ____
1.0 ____
Other ____

G. Curriculum and instruction

1. Describe the process by which the curriculum is reviewed and established. Indicate who is responsible for the final determination of curriculum policy. In what ways are the administration, faculty and military involved in the development of academic programs and in the procedures for curricular change?

2. Are methods of instruction related to the objectives of the program, the capabilities of the students, and the institution's standards of quality?

3. How are the quality and effectiveness of instruction regularly evaluated?

4. Describe any formal procedures used in evaluating the student outcomes of courses and programs in terms of stated objectives.

5. How is the quality of instruction and student outcomes related to the quality control system on the home campus?

6. Are there provisions for recording the post-program attainments of graduates? Are the procedures similar to those employed at the home campus?

7. Identify any strengths or weaknesses in the methods of curriculum development, and the evaluation of instruction and student achievement. What solutions are proposed?

H. Learning Resources and Physical Facilities

1. Briefly describe the learning resources (library, audio-visual, etc.) and physical facilities that are available on the military installation to support the educational programs of the institution?

2. Are the facilities and learning resources adequate to support the programs?

3. What additional facilities or learning resources are needed? What measures have the military authorities taken to supplement them?

I. Student Services

1. Briefly describe the student services available on this base. How are the academic advisement and personal counseling needs of students met?

2. What are the roles of the institution and the military in the coordination of program and student services? Is this coordination effective?

3. What additional services are needed?

J. Financial Resources

1. Briefly describe the financial arrangements in support of the educational program on the base.

2. Using charts present the financial history of the on-base programs showing sources of income, expenditures, and allocation of excess of income over expenditures by the institution. How do income and costs for on-base programs compare with those on campus?

3. Are the programs adequately supported? What changes in financing of on-base programs are proposed?

K. Catalog and Course Procedures

1. Is a separate catalog published for your programs on this base? If yes, how often is it published. Is a consolidated catalog published on base?

2. In each of the following areas please indicate any variance between home campus procedures and those on-base. If there is variance, please explain why.

   a. admission requirements Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   b. course titles Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   c. course descriptions Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   d. statement of required readings, examinations, papers Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   e. credits Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   f. contact hours Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   g. frequency of offering Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   h. pre and co-requisites Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   i. degree program requirements Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   j. tuition Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   k. refund policies Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   l. attendance requirements and withdrawal policies Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   m. grading system Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   n. grievance procedure Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   o. retention standards Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   p. research and thesis requirements Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

   q. placement service with job/applicant historical file Yes ___ No ___ Variance ___

L. Academic Support Services Administration

1. Ratio of academic administrators by head-count and FTE to students by head-count and FTE

2. Ratio of staff administrators by head-count and FTE to students by head-count and FTE

3. Ratio of student personnel administrators by head-count and FTE to students by head-count and FTE

4. Campus representatives

   a. hours per week for each on this base
   b. students per representative on this base
   c. number of bases representative serves
   d. degrees held by each representative
   e. number and percent with military experience
   f. describe job specifications and training program, if any, for representatives on this base

M. Program Data

Please supply data for each degree program. Note and justify academically if data is at variance from home campus.

1. Number of required courses offered in lower division ______ upper division ______

2. Number of elective courses offered in lower division ______ upper division ______

3. Registration per course

4. Percent of students admitted to program on probation

5. Percent attrition for program attributed to:
   academic failure ______
   non-punitive withdrawal ______
   non-punitive grade ______
   hardship ______
   Total percent attrition ______

6. Percent attrition of students admitted to program on probation

7. Percent of initial cohort completing degree program

8. Percent of initial cohort completing 16 credit hours ____, 32 credit hours ____, 64 credit hours ____

9. For each course and subject area

    a. number of credits generated

    b. h.c. enrollment

    c. classroom clock hours (50 minutes) per week, indicate academic unit (quarter, semester)

    d. laboratory or studio hours (50 minutes) per week, indicate academic unit (quarter, semester)

    e. credit hours awarded

    f. $\frac{c + (\frac{d}{3})}{e} = x$ (Where x is less than 1.0, explain)

    g. tuition + applicable fees

    h. $\frac{g}{(\frac{d}{3}) + c} =$

    i. $\frac{g}{e} =$

    j. (by department) number and percent of courses with
    1 prerequisite ______
    2 prerequisites ______
    3 prerequisites ______

    k. percent of course enrollments by department with waiver of prerequisites

    l. waiver of prerequisites approved by instructor ______
    department head ______ dean _______

    m. approval for courses/programs must be obtained from;

    faculty committee ____ department head ____ college ____

    dean (identify whether "academic dean" or dean of off-campus program) ____

    university ____ state ____

N. Provide grade distribution by section, course, department and program. Compare with same information from home campus and from other off-campus locations.

O. Provide data relevant to grades as predictors of success in subsequent courses, degree program.

P. Outcomes (by aggregate, h.c., FTE students and degree program)

1. Number of degrees awarded (list by type of degree, B.A., Ph.D., etc.)

2. Percent using tuition assistance

3. Percent using G.I. Bill

4. Percent using other benefits (social security, SEOG, BEOG, VEAP, etc.)

5. Dollar value of tuition assistance per program (institution, base)

6. Percent enrollees taking advanced tests. Identify by test, GRE, LSAT, MCAT, etc.)

7. Provide base-wide scores on above tests showing base norms and distribution compared to national norms and distribution

8. Provide average number of credits per student for
CLEP
CAEL
Correspondence
MOS - AFSQ
"hitch or military experience"

9. Expenditures for military base program per student FTE by category for the year ending _____ (most recent accounting period)

    a. instruction per FTE
    b. library per FTE
    c. academic support (total per FTE)
        (1) academic administration per FTE
        (2) registrar functions
    d. general administration per FTE
    e. student services (total per FTE)
        (1) academic counseling per FTE

f. physical facilities and equipment (total per FTE)
  (1) facilities per FTE
  (2) furnishings and equipment

Provide the same information for a-f for the home campus

11. Does the state provide capitation funds for the on-base program?

MILITARY BASE CASE STUDY

Name of Institution ______________________________

Location of Off-Campus Unit ______________________________

ROSTER OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF FOR OFF-CAMPUS UNIT

Name of Faculty Members (Note: Group by Department-Discipline)	Rank	Most Advanced Degree	Years of Advanced Work Beyond Master's	Other Department In Which Person Teaches	Employment Outside This Institution For Which Compensation Is Received	Teaching Load In Clock Hours Per Week

APPENDIX C - Part 3

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

Dear

We wish to invite your participation, as a visiting committee member, in the national study of postsecondary degree programs currently being offered by colleges and universities on U.S. military bases. This Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases is being conducted for the United States Department of Defense by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the postsecondary commissions of the six regional accrediting agencies. The project is being administered by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The Advisory Committee for the study consist of the president of COPA, the executive secretaries/ directors of all the regional postsecondary accrediting commissions, representatives of each service branch, and a representative from the Department of Defense.

The Case Study is a serious attempt to gather information necessary to assess the nature and quality of degree programs being offered on military bases. Briefly the goals of the study are as follows:

1. To identify the current roles of:
   (a) postsecondary institutions,
   (b) military organizations and personnel,
   (c) the states,
   (d) regional accrediting commissions, and
   (e) other organizations or agencies concerned with on-base postsecondary educational programs provided by civilian institutions.

2. To make recommendations concerning the proper roles of each of the organizations listed in 1. above.

3. To make recommendations for an on-going system of quality control in institutional programs provided on base.

Kenneth E. Young, President / Eugene I. Van Antwerp, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate

One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 760, Washington, D. C. 20036 phone: (202) 452-1433

4. To provide a reservoir of data about these postsecondary educational programs for use by the military (base commanders, educational service officers, and Department of Defense personnel), institutional personnel, and accrediting commissions in the development of appropriate policies and procedures for such programs.

A committee visit to each base selected for participation is an integral part of the study. You are invited to serve on the visiting committee for the ______ . (name of base ______. The dates for this visit are ________ ____. Visiting committee members will each prepare, while on the installation, a draft of an evaluative report based on institutional reports (sent in advance), an installation report (to be examined on base), and the findings of the on-site visit. Before leaving the base the committee will present an oral report to the Base Commander and the institutional representatives. A draft of the written report will be submitted by the chairman of the visiting committee to the appropriate institutional and military personnel in order to check for accuracy. Final reports will be sent to the chairman of the Advisory Committee, to be used in preparation of an overall report of findings and conclusions concerning military base education in the United States and abroad.

All expenses for travel, meals, and lodging for committee members will be paid by the Case Study. Committee members will be responsible for their own travel arrangements. The committee members for ________ ____Base should plan to arrive by ____ p.m. on ______ with departure at approximately ____ p.m. on ______. Details concerning arrangements will be sent upon your acceptance.

We hope very much that you will be able to participate in the visiting committee phase of this important study.

Sincerely,

Gordon W. Sweet
Chairman of the Advisory Committee
Military Base Case Study
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges
and Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

GWS/el

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

GUIDELINES FOR MILITARY BASE CASE STUDY VISITING COMMITTEES

Plan of the Study

The Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases is a serious attempt to gather information about and make assessments of degree programs on military bases. It is being conducted for the U.S. Department of Defense by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the postsecondary commissions of the six regional accrediting associations.

Briefly the goals of the study are:

1. To identify the current roles of:
   (a) postsecondary institutions,
   (b) military organizations and personnel,
   (c) the states,
   (d) regional accrediting commissions, and
   (e) other organizations or agencies concerned with on-base postsecondary educational programs provided by civilian institutions.

2. To make recommendations concerning the proper roles of each of the organizations listed in 1. above.

3. To evaluate the effectiveness of civilian postsecondary institutions providing degree programs for personnel on selected military bases.

4. To make recommendations for an on-going system of quality control in institutional programs provided on base.

5. To provide a reservoir of data about these postsecondary educational programs for use by the military (base commanders, educational service officers, and Department of Defense personnel), institutional personnel, and accrediting commissions in the development of appropriate policies and procedures for such programs.

Kenneth E. Young, President / Eugene I. Van Antwerp, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate

One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 760, Washington, D. C. 20036 phone (202) 452-1433

The plan for the Case Study is as follows:

1. A number of bases have been selected by the Case Study Advisory Committee to participate in the study.

2. Each institution offering postsecondary degree programs on one or more selected bases is being invited to complete a two-part report. Part One will consist of a list of all off-campus degree programs offered by the institution on military bases. Part Two will consist of a case study report which describes and analyzes only those degree programs offered by the institution on bases selected for the case study.

3. The institutional reports will be furnished to visiting committees selected by the chairman of the Case Study Advisory Committee after consultation with representatives of each of the regional accrediting agencies. A committee will be appointed to visit each selected base, with the majority of the members representing the region in which the base is located and members from other regions as well. Each committee will include one or more regional commission staff members for the Case Study, and a number of observers from the Department of Defense, service branches, state approval agencies, Veterans Administration, and the Office of Education. Expenses for the visit will be borne by the Case Study grant.

4. When each of the selected bases is visited, institutions will be expected to have a representative present during the committee visit.

General Procedures

1. Members of the visiting committee will receive prior to the base visit reports completed by each institution offering degree programs on base. They may also receive catalogs and other printed materials produced by the individual institution. Before arriving at the base each member of the committee will read the reports and all other materials pertinent to specific assignments made in advance by the committee chairman.

   Before the visit each member will receive memoranda concerning the schedule of the visit, suggestions regarding transportation, time of the initial and final meetings, and a listing of the committee personnel. Committee members will make their own travel arrangements. Travel by personal automobile will be reimbursed at 17 cents per mile, not to exceed the cost of tourist air fare plus airport transportation. Air travel will be reimbursed for tourist class air fare.

2. Role of the Committee

   (a) The committee is to provide a professional opinion, based on their analysis of reports, supplementary materials, and the findings of the on-site visit, as to the appropriate roles in the development and delivery of on-base postsecondary education for:

   (1) the institutions
   (2) the military
   (3) the accrediting commissions
   (4) the states
   (5) other

   (b) The following criteria and guidelines should be utilized in describing and assessing the effectiveness of educational programs on base. The committee's written report should deal with these criteria on three levels: (1) there should be a description of policies and procedures currently followed on base, (2) there should be a notation of how these policies and procedures differ from those on the home campuses, and (3) there should be a professional evaluation of the effectiveness of the policies and procedures, of their strengths and weaknesses along with recommendations for improvement directed toward individual institutions and administrative units, both military and civilian.

Process Criteria

1. Administration

   (a) How are institutions selected for on-base programs? How often do senior administrators from the parent institution visit the base? How is the program administered in relation to the home institution? What are the responsibilities of institutional authorities vis-a-vis military authorities? Who determines financial arrangements?

   (b) How do base education purposes and objectives relate to those of the institutions which provide degree programs?

(c) Who make decisions on academic matters?

(d) How are educational priorities determined by military authorities? Are course selections compatible with the overall objectives of the base program and with those of the parent institution? How are decisions made regarding assignment of programs to the various institutions?

(e) What student services are available and are they coordinated to avoid duplication and to effect economics?

(f) Have the appropriate regional accrediting commissions been informed of new base programs by the institutions involved?

(g) Overall, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the administrative arrangements as they affect educational programs and what improvements should be made?

2. Academic Program

(a) What are the qualifications of the faculty? Who selects the faculty? What is the number and proportion of adjunct instructors? Have adjunct faculty had previous college teaching experience on a campus? What are the procedures for monitoring faculty performance?

(b) Is there faculty input into academic matters on military installations? What is the role of home campus faculty in curriculum development, faculty selection, program evaluation, etc.?

(c) Are there stated admissions policies? Do they vary from those of the parent institution?

(d) Is curriculum consistent with program objectives?

(e) Are there stated policies in regard to what is expected of students? Do students have the opportunity to evaluate instruction and their on-base educational program?

(f) What learning resources are available--library, audio-visual, etc. ? In what ways do they support the learning objectives of programs?

(g) What physical facilities in terms of classrooms and laboratories are available? Are they adequate to support the programs offered?

(h) What are the procedures for record keeping of student files?

(i) What financial arrangements support the on-base educational program?

Outcomes Criteria

(1) Are there formal procedures for evaluating the student outcomes of courses and programs in terms of stated objectives? Is there regular, formal evaluation of the total program and its effectiveness?

(2) Are there provisions for recording the post-program attainments of graduates?

(3) How much and what types of military education and experiential learning are accepted for credit toward degree programs? Are credits earned on base accepted by other institutions? How are these evaluated?

Final Report

Before the committee leaves the base, the chairman is to obtain a rough draft of a written report from each member of the committee.

The visiting committee will give an oral report of their findings to the Base Commander and/or his representatives, institutional representatives, and other before leaving the military installation.

The chairman will then prepare a draft of the full report to achieve consistency of presentation. Copies will be submitted to the appropriate institutional and military personnel to be checked for errors of fact and possible conclusions made on the basis of incomplete and/or inaccurate information. When the chairman judges the report to be correct, copies of the final report will be distributed to the chairman and members of the advisory committee for the Case Study. A comprehensive report will be produced by the Advisory Committee summarizing findings and conclusions and making appropriate recommendations for the institutions, the military, and the regional accrediting commissions.

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE REPORT

Each member of the visiting committee should complete a draft of his part of the report before the end of the committee visit. In writing the report the "Guidelines for Military Base Case Study Visiting Committees" should be utilized, taking into account the role of the committee in 2 (a) and (b) under General Procedures of the Guidelines.

The following is a suggested outline for the committee report.

I. Introduction (arrangements, acknowledgements, etc.)

II. Off-Campus Postsecondary Education at the Base

  A. Institutional Purpose and Goals

  B. Organization and Administration

  C. Institutional Educational Program

    (1) Admissions
    (2) Curriculum
    (3) Instruction
    (4) Learning resources and physical facilities
    (5) Student services
    (6) Financial resources
    (7) Systems for quality assurance

III. Current Roles

  A. Postsecondary Institutions

  B. Military Organizations

  C. States

  D. Regional Accrediting Commissions

  E. Other Organizations or Agencies

Kenneth E. Young, President / Eugene I. Van Antwerp, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate

One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 760, Washington, D. C. 20036 phone (202) 452-1433

IV. Summary Recommendations

   A. Admissions

   B. Curriculum

   C. Instruction

   D. Learning Resources and Physical Facilities

   E. Student Services

   F. Financial Resources

   G. Quality Concerns

   H. Role Definitions

An attempt should be made to describe and evaluate the programs of each institution serving the base (as is outlined in Section II). Section III should identify the current roles of A-E as they affect the base and Section IV should summarize the recommendations as to institutional programs and how they function in the base environment. Each committee member should keep a record of persons interviewed while on base. The committee chairmen should record the names of the official representative, if present, of each institution on the base.

APPENDIX C - Part 4

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

REPORT OF MILITARY BASES SELECTED FOR INCLUSION IN THE CASE STUDY OF OFF-CAMPUS POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION ON MILITARY BASES

The Case Study of Off-Campus Postsecondary Education on Military Bases is an attempt to obtain a clearer picture of the variety and quality of educational programs offered by civilian institutions on selected military installations. Some of the procedures and criteria to be used are similar to those employed in the accreditation of academic institutions, but it should be clearly understood that this study does not involve the accreditation of the institutions or the base programs.

The outline which follows is designed to assist the Education Services Officer in providing information concerning the various programs offered on the base by civilian institutions. In some cases the data requested or questions asked may not apply specifically to the base or its programs, but the ESO is urged to provide the most complete information possible. The institutions conducting programs on the base will be providing detailed information about their programs.

The reports prepared by the base and the institutions will provide essential material for a committee designated by the Case Study Advisory Committee to visit the base and evaluate the programs. If there are any questions about the type or quantity of information required, they should be directed to:

Gordon W. Sweet
Chairman of the Advisory Committee
Military Base Case Study
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
795 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30308

The following informational report should be completed in advance of the committee visit to the base, a copy sent to your service department point of contact as far in advance of the visit as possible, and then the report should be made available to the committee at the time of their visit.

Please complete questions requiring a narrative answer on a separate sheet after repeating the question. Questions requiring statistical data may be answered on this form.

Kenneth E. Young, President / Eugene I. Van Antwerp, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 760, Washington, D. C. 20036   phone (202) 452-1433

A. Procurement of On-base Degree Programs

1. List each college now providing on your base courses leading to a degree, the degree programs offered by each at the present time and during 1978, and the length of time each institution has been serving your base.

2. For each institution indicate why the college was brought on the base. For example, was there a special need or request for the course or program? By whom?

3. What procedures does your base use to typically identify or determine whether or not a particular institution should be invited to provide degree programs on your base?

4. How does your base make contact with the academic community to explore possible new offerings?

5. Are all local institutions typically requested to respond to the need for a course or program? Be as specific as possible in describing how this occurs.

B. Program Requirements

When asking institutions to submit proposals for an on-base degree program, do those on base who are responsible for obtaining these programs specify to the institutions any of the following? Please check those which are specified.

___ 1. Number of courses to be offered

___ 2. Frequency and/or sequence of course offerings

___ 3. Faculty qualifications

___ 4. Student entrance requirements (prerequisites, tests, etc.)

___ 5. Amount and/or types of credit from other programs to be counted toward a degree (either previous to or after initiation of degree program)

___ 6. Credit to be granted by the institution for military experience _per se_ (MOS's, ratings, etc.)

___ 7. Minimum time for completion of the degree

___ 8. Thesis requirements (if graduate degree)

___ 9. Class size limitations

___ 10. Enrollment minimum

___ 11. Administrative services to be provided by the institution

___ 12. Counseling services to be provided by the institution

___ 13. Availability of office hours to be provided by the institution

___ 14. Facilities to be provided by the base

___ 15. Institutional compliance with the statement on off-campus programs of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

___ 16. Provision by the institution of external evaluations of acceptability such as accreditation or approval by V.A. State Approval Agency

___ 17. If the answer to No. 16 is yes, are accreditation and self-studies used in deciding which institution should offer an on-base program

___ 18. Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of the programs

C. Space Allocation for Education Services

Estimate the total square feet allocated to each institution providing degree programs for the following:

__________ Classrooms

__________ College representative's office

__________ Storage of supplies and/or workroom

__________ Books

__________ Laboratories

__________ Lounge

D. Total Budget Allocation by Base to Support Degree Programs

__________ Books and supplies

__________ Furnishings for classrooms and offices

__________ Audio-visual resources

__________ Computer time

__________ Laboratory equipment and supplies

__________ Supplies for faculty

E. Student Services

1. What are the functions of the on-base institutional representatives?
2. How are they selected and who pays for them?
3. Does each institution serving your base provide its own representative?
4. How many hours per week are they available?
5. How many persons does your base provide for counseling, advising, and registration for degree programs?
6. How are they selected and who pays for them?
7. What are their functions?

F. Educational Program

1. What methods are used by your base to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of programs and institutions currently offering programs on your base?
2. What information is regularly collected by the base to aid in the assessment of program quality and effectiveness? Who collects this information and what is done with it?

G. Additional Comments

Would you comment on any aspect of your base education program not covered above which you think would help the visiting committee better understand what you are trying to accomplish.

APPENDIX D

Participating Military Bases and Institutions

Part I: Military Bases
Part II: Institutions

APPENDIX D - Part 1

PARTICIPATING MILITARY BASES

DATE OF VISIT	BASE
March 25-28, 1979	MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida. William L. Turner, Chairman
April 22-26, 1979	Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune; Marine Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C. William L. Flowers, Chairman
April 30-May 4, 1979	Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska. Hector H. Lee, Chairman
May 5-12, 1979	Kadena Air Force Base; Marine Corps Base Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa. Robert L. Maurer, Chairman
May 6-9, 1979	Naval Station Mayport, Florida. Robert Coyne, Chairman
May 13-17, 1979	McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey. Stanley Smith, Chairman
May 20-25, 1979	Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.; Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Va.; Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.; Naval Guided Missiles School, Dam Neck, Va. William L. Turner, Chairman
June 3-7, 1979	Ft. Carson Army Base, Colorado. Thomas Reckerd, Chairman
June 3-7, 1979	Naval Air Stations, Miramar and North Island, San Diego, California. Richard L. Williamson, Chairman
June 23-July 2, 1979	United States Army V Corps, Frankfurt Community; Rhein-Main Air Force Base; Lindsey Air Station, Wiesbaden, West Germany. Fred B. Bentley, Chairman
July 15-19, 1979	Ft. Stewart Army Base, Hunter Army Air Field, Ga. Charles McQuillan, Chairman

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Alaska, University of, Anchorage, Alaska
Anchorage Community College, Anchorage, Alaska
Azusa Pacific College, Azusa, California
Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana
Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake, Washington
Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts
Burlington County College, Pemberton, New Jersey
Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan
Central Texas College, Killeen, Texas
Chapman College, Orange, California
City Colleges of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
Coastal Carolina Community College, Jacksonville, North Carolina
Colorado, University of at Colorado Springs, Colorado
Craven Community College, New Bern, North Carolina
East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach, Florida
Florida Junior College, Jacksonville, Florida
George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia
Georgia Military College, Milledgeville, Georgia
Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia
Golden Gate University, San Francisco, California
Hawaii Community College, Hilo, Hawaii
La Verne, University of, La Verne, California
Los Angeles Community Colleges, Los Angeles, California
Maryland, Univ. of, University College, College Park, Maryland
Mercer County Community College, Trenton, New Jersey
National University, San Diego, California
Northern Colorado, University of, Greeley, Colorado
North Florida, University of, Jacksonville, Florida
Oklahoma, University of, Norman, Oklahoma
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia
Pepperdine University, Malibu, California
Pikes Peak Community College, Colorado Springs, Colorado
Regis College, Denver, Colorado
Rider College, Lawrenceville, New Jersey
St. Leo College, St. Leo, Florida
San Diego State University, San Diego, California
Savannah State College, Savannah, Georgia
Southern California, University of, Los Angeles, California
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Illinois
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Illinois
Southwestern College, Chula Vista, California
Tampa, University of, Tampa, Florida
Tidewater Community College, Portsmouth, Virginia
Trenton State College, Trenton, New Jersey
Troy State University, Troy, Alabama
United States International University, San Diego, California

APPENDIX E

Military Base Case Study On-Site Team Members

APPENDIX E- Part 1

MILITARY BASE CASE STUDY ON-SITE TEAM MEMBERS

Dr. John E. Anderson, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Columbus College, Columbus, Georgia 31907

Dr. Donavon Auble, Associate Provost for Academic Analysis and Professor of Educational Psychology, Miami University, Roudebush Hall, Oxford, Ohio 45056

Dr. Richard H. Barbe, Professor of Educational Administration, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dr. George Benson, Chairman, Marketing Department, College of Business Administration, St. John's University, Grand Central and Utopia Parkways, New York, New York 11439

Dr. Fred B. Bentley, President, Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, North Carolina 28754

Mr. William L. Bolin, Coordinator, Engineering Technology, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

Dr. Egon Brenner, Deputy Chancellor, City University of New York, 535 E. 80th Street, New York, New York 10021

Dr. Todd H. Bullard, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Rochester Institute of Technology, One Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, New York 14623

Dr. Paul Castleberry, Department of Political Science, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 99163

Dr. Eugene Clark, Professor of Economics-Business, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 99163

Dr. Robert Coe, Dean, School of Business, California Polytechnic University at San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Dr. David W. Cole, Vice President and Dean of the College, High Point College, High Point, North Carolina 27262

Dr. Edward M. Collins, Jr., President, The College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina 29401

Dr. Robert F. Coyne, Director of International Programs, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Mr. Henry Davison, Professor of Engineering Technology,
St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg,
Florida 33733

Dr. Robert Dolphin, Jr., Dean, School of Graduate Studies,
Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45435

Mr. Donald V. Drury, Director of the Library, Menlo College,
Menlo Park, California 94025

Dr. William Flowers, Associate Dean, Extension Division, Virginia
Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg,
Virginia 24061

Mr. Kenneth Fogg, President, Waterbury State Technical College,
Waterbury, Connecticut 06708

Dr. Phillip E. Frandson, Dean, University Extension, University
of California--Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024

Dr. Merle E. Frey, Associate Professor of Management and Industrial
Relations, Stillman School of Business, (Home Address) 172 Claremont
Road, Ridgewood, New Jersey 07450

Dr. James D. Gray, Chairman, Business Related Division, DeKalb
College, Clarkston, Georgia 30021

Dr. Milton A. Grodsky, Dean, University of Maryland, University
College, University Boulevard at Adelphi Road, College Park,
Maryland 20742

Dr. Ernest E. Harrill, Chairman, Department of Political Science,
Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina 29613

Dr. Robert D. Harvey, Instruction and Coordinator of Engineering,
College of DuPage, 22nd and Lambert, Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Mr. James V. Jones, Director of University Libraries, Case
Western Reserve University, 11161 E. Boulevard, Cleveland,
Ohio 44106

Dr. George G. Killinger, Board of Pardons and Paroles, Stephen
F. Austin Building, Room 711, P. O. Box 13401, Capitol Station,
Austin, Texas 78711

Dr. Hector H. Lee, Emeritus Professor of English, Sonoma State
University, 3617 Greenhill, Santa Rosa, California 95404

Dr. George Lewis, Director of Libraries, Mississippi State
University, Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

Dr. Howard D. Lowe, Professor and Chairman, Accounting and Finance, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dr. Alice S. Mandanis, Academic Dean, Marymount College of Virginia, Arlington, Virginia 22207

Dr. Robert Maurer, Emeritus Dean of Graduate Studies, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, California 91768

Dr. Charles McQuillen, Dean, College of Business and Economics, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho 83843

Dr. Barry L. Mellinger, Dean/Director, Occupational Division, DeKalb Community College, 495 North Indian Creek Drive, Clarkston, Georgia 30021

Dr. Stanley N. Miller, Professor, Social Science and Education, Head, Education Department, Pennsylvania State University, Capitol Campus, Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Dr. Harry W. More, Jr., Professor of Criminal Justice and Public Administration, San Jose State University, San Jose, California 95192

Dr. Richard E. Neel, Dean, College of Business Administration, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNCC Station, Charlotte, North Carolina 28223

Dr. John F. O'Connell, Assistant Dean of Students, Western State University College of Law, 1111 North State College Boulevard, Fullerton, California 92631

Ms. Martha O'Rourke, Librarian, Stillman College, Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35401

Dr. Jerry Padgett, Dean of the School of Business, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730

Mr. J. Carlyle Parker, Head of Public Services and Assistant Director of the Library, California State College, Stanislaus, 800 Monte Vista, Turlock, California 95380

Dr. Thomas E. Reckerd, Vice President/Dean, Indiana Vocational-Technical College, 616 Wabash, Lafayette, Indiana 47905

Dr. J. Paul Reynolds, 1813 Azalea Drive, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403

Dr. Lawrence H. Rice, Graduate Dean, Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho 83209

Dr. Katherine B. Seibert, School of Business, California State
Polytechnic University--Pomona, 3801 W. Temple, Pomona,
California 91768

Dr. Donald Sime, Vice President and Dean, School of Business
and Management, Pepperdine University, 8035 S. Vermont, Los
Angeles, California 90044

Dr. R. Eugene Stephens, Associate Professor, College of Criminal
Justice, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South
Carolina 29208

Dr. Ronald Stoodley, Director, New Hampshire Vocational-Technical
College, Claremont, New Hampshire 03743

Dr. William Stosberg, Assistant Dean, Florida Atlantic University,
Boca Raton, Florida 33431

Dr. Bonnie R. Strickland, Professor and Chairman, Department of
Psychology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Dr. James B. Tintera, Professor and Director, Center for Instructional
Technology, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202

Dr. William L. Turner, Vice Chancellor for Extension and Public
Service, North Carolina State University, P. O. Box 5125,
Raleigh, North Carolina 27650

Dr. Burton J. Williams, Dean, School of Social and Behavioral
Science, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg,
Washington 98926

Dr. Richard L. Williamson, Dean, College of Business Administration,
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, California 90045

APPENDIX F

Military Base Case Study On-Site Observers

MILITARY BASE CASE STUDY ON-SITE OBSERVERS

Department of the Army

Col. R. E. Brown, Director of Education, Department of the Army, HQDA (DAAG-ED) Hoffman Building #1, Room 1434, 2461 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22322

Mr. Tilton Davis, HQ Department of the Army (DAAG-ED), Hoffman Building #1, Room 1434, 2461 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22322

Department of Defense

Dr. Gerald B. Kauvar, Special Assistant for Education, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics), Room 3B-922, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301

Major W. S. Sellman, Staff Specialist/Voluntary Education Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics), Room 3B-922, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301

Education Commission of the States

Dr. Warren G. Hill, Executive Director, Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, Lincoln Tower Building, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295

Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges

Ms. Frances C. Lapinski, Coordinator, Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Harry K. Miller, Jr., Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036

Dr. James Nickerson, Director, Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036

U. S. Air Force

Mr. William Cox, Headquarters, United States Air Force, Washington, DC 20330

Mr. Robert Quick, HQ USAF/MPPE, Room 4C-240, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330

Mr. Joseph Littlefield, Chief of Educational Services, HQ MAC/DPAL

U. S. Marine Corps

Lt. Col. John Keenan, USMC, c/o Commandant U. S. Marine Corps,
HQ U. S. Marine Corps, Code OTTE, Washington, D. C. 20308

U. S. Navy

Dr. Frances Kelly, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations,
OP-114E, Room 2833, Navy Annex, Arlington, Virginia 20370

State Representatives

California

Dr. Roy W. Steeves, Assistant Chief, Office of Private Postsecondary
Education, State of California, Department of Education, 601 West
Fifth Street, Los Angeles, California 90017

Colorado

Dr. Norman B. Dodge, Assistant Director, Department of Higher Education,
Colorado Commission on Higher Education, 1550 Lincoln Street,
Room 210, Denver, Colorado 80203

Florida

Dr. C. Wayne Freeburg, Executive Director, Florida Board of Independent
Colleges and Universities, c/o Department of Education, State of
Florida, Tallahassee, Florida 32304

New Jersey

Mr. Joseph L. Ravelli, Assistant Director, Office for Independent
Colleges and Universities, New Jersey Department of Higher
Education, 225 W. State Street, P. O. Box 1293, Trenton,
New Jersey 08625

North Carolina

Dr. John F. Corey, Assistant Vice President, The University of North
Carolina, General Administration, P. O. Box 2688, Chapel Hill,
North Carolina 27514

U. S. Office of Education

Dr. Lawrence Friedrich, DEAE, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202

Veterans Administration

Dr. George Arnstein, Education Consultant, Veterans Administration, Office of General Counsel, Washington, D. C. 20420

Mr. Jack Garrison, Veterans Administration, Education and Rehabilitation Service, Program Administration Staff, Washington, D. C. 20420

Mr. John Headen, Veterans Administration, Education and Rehabilitation Service, Program Administration Staff, Washington, D. C. 20420

Dr. Robert B. Holbrook, Counseling Psychologist, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C. 20420

Ms. Mary Indianer, Education and Rehabilitation Service, Program Administration Staff, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C. 20420

Mr. James M. Laws, Jr., Compliance Survey Program Staff, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C. 20420

Mr. Alan Zoeckler, 225B, Veterans Administration, 810 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20420

APPENDIX G

FRACHE Policy on Military Base Education

FEDERATION OF REGIONAL ACCREDITING COMMISSIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY ACCREDITED OR CANDIDATE INSTITUTIONS ON MILITARY BASES

The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education is pleased to note that the military services are very much aware of the critical need for well educated manpower, and fully endorses the development of educational programs on military bases designed to provide for the personal and professional growth of personnel through educational courses and programs in cooperation with accredited and candidate postsecondary institutions.

Institutions are encouraged to cooperate with the military services in designing appropriate courses and programs for both military personnel and also such military-related or civilian personnel as it may be considered feasible to accept. In establishing courses or programs, institutions should recognize that special considerations frequently must be made; e.g., courses designed for the undergraduate on a college campus or for professional preparation in an academic discipline may not adequately meet the needs or capitalize on the experience of military personnel. The usual fixed requirements of residence and traditional methods of accumulating credits may fail to allow for the unique circumstances of the military person. Hence, it is the Federation's view that an institution offering such courses, while holding to the basic quality essential to good educational programs, should feel free to adapt methods, policies, and procedures to the regimen and conditions under which the military student must perform his duties and pursue his studies.

Providing educational opportunities for interested personnel on military basis is a dual responsibility. Certain guides and requisites can be established which may provide both incentive and direction for officers of the military in positions of responsibility on base. Likewise there are helpful guides that might provide direction for those from the college campus responsible for such services. Successful programs in these situations will not be realized unless there is mutual understanding, a sharing of responsibilities, and a marshaling of resources essential for such offerings.

1. Guides and Responsibilities of Institutions

A. Programs offered should relate to the purposes and adhere to the educational standards of the institution.

Provision should be made for students to work toward completion of appropriate programs offered by the institution. Without compromising the principle that quality will be equivalent to that on campus, course offerings might be more flexible or nontraditional than those required of the campus student. Thus the educational goal of the military base student might be given special consideration within the general graduation requirements of the institution without depreciation of standards. Although institutions should refrain from offering work unrelated to either their mission or resources, they may provide service or cultural courses without credit when such experiences can be of personal worth or upgrade competencies required of the military person.

B. In organizing and administering base program, institutions should take into consideration the uniqueness of military situations.

The staff member assigned the responsibility of representing an institution in its military base effort must recognize the unique demands of the situation. He must realize that the first demand upon the base personnel is a military commitment, and arrangements for such individuals must fit into this demand. Although organization and administration practices need not duplicate or conform to campus routines, appropriate standards should be maintained.

C. Student personnel policies and services should be such as to facilitate the success of a program on a military base.

Admission requirements should reflect the demands of postsecondary level studies and degree requirements, and at the same time take into consideration the student's background in terms of equivalencies. Registration procedures should be accommodated to the conditions under which the military work, and counseling services provided by relevantly prepared and experienced individuals. Special provisions should be made for program advising so students may know requirements as well as make adjustments in terms of their own educational goals. Adjustments may need to be made in residence requirements and/or the substitution of courses for transfer credit or degree purposes. Provision should be made for the possibility of advanced placement or credit by examination or evaluation.

D. Both faculty and instruction should be of recognized quality.

For military base education programs, the faculty are drawn from the cooperating institution, the military base staff, and from other institutions. Qualified specialists without institutional affiliation may also be employed. Instructors must be professionally competent in regard to specific preparation and recency of involvement in the field. When participating institutions employ faculty from other institutions on a part-time basis, it is recommended that they do so with permission from the faculty members' full-time employer; this will avoid the danger of excessive overloads.

The quality of instruction should be comparable to that on campus, with the same degree of concern for teaching tools and learning resources. Necessary library materials must be available or accessible. Special provisions may be needed for the completion of course work when students are called from base. Regardless of departures from campus practice, grades should not be given until students meet all course requirements.

E. Integrity among institutions offering programs on a single base is essential.

Institutions placed in competition with each other in making bids to provide services must guard against the erosion of quality of instruction. To avoid negative aspects of competition, several participating institutions on a base should consult among themselves and with the military education services officer. In all deliberations and negotiations, it is expected that a high degree of integrity will be maintained.

II. Guides and Obligations of the Military

A. The military should not hesitate to initiate negotiations for the purpose of providing educational programs on base.

When postsecondary educational opportunities are not being provided and when personnel on base express an interest in them, military officials should initiate the action necessary for securing such programs. The leadership should first assess and identify the types of programs and services desired before approaching an institution. It is always helpful to know at the outset precisely what is desired, the approximate number of students that are likely to be involved, and the resources which the base might be able to provide. Education officers should be open in making needs known to interested institutions and in inviting proposals for programs. Memoranda of understanding or contracts should be negotiated directly between military bases and participating institutions. Where possible, it recommended that such memoranda of understanding or contracts run for more than one year to assure program stability. Perhaps bases could work toward standardization of contracts and thus insure greater consistency in the services provided by an institution.

B. A joint meeting of both institution and base leadership should occur early.

After the educational needs of base personnel are determined there should be a joint exploration and planning session of base and institution representatives. Such a meeting should define the needs, identify essential resources, describe the general nature of programs desired, and define the specific responsibilities of all parties. Written agreements should be reached prior to initiation of the program to guide both the base and the participating institution in carrying out the program.

C. The military will have responsibility for supplying certain essential resources.

In addition to identifying programs desired, the number of persons involved, and the costs, the military should expect to provide certain essentials for such programs on base:

1. Suitable and adequate classrooms
2. Space and facilities for a library or learning center
3. Adequate learning resources to support the program
4. Laboratory space and essential equipment for courses requiring laboratory experiments
5. Other equipment and supplies (e.g., typewriters, business machines, etc.) essential to the courses offered.

It is the responsibility of the educational institution to notify the military base of additional or extraordinary needs sufficiently in advance to make it possible for the base to fulfill the request.

The military in most instances will be expected to provide certain initial funds for starting the service.

D. The military must give full support and backing to the program once it is initiated.

No program will succeed without the continuing support of the post commander, his staff, and the highest officials of the respective service branch. A postsecondary program will also need the attention of an educational officer who is a qualified educator and is given time and staff to manage and evaluate the program and provide essential academic advisement. The educational officer will need the full support of all base officials. The success of such programs is highly dependent upon the experience, leadership, and resourcefulness of such an individual.

E. There is need for greater uniformity of policy and practice among the various branches of the military.

It has been noted that differences exist in both policy and practice between various branches of the service. FRACHE urges that steps be taken toward the following:

1. Greater commonality in administrative organization of educational programs throughout the services.
2. More common or comparable scales of tuition support
3. More common agreement on what constitutes adequate classroom space and equipment.

Greater uniformity of commitment on the part of the various branches could do much to increase comparability of programs and services among military bases, and would improve efficiency and reduce the administrative burden on institutions providing educational programs to more than one base.

F. On bases where non-military personnel are permitted to take courses, it is understood that the first responsibility in terms of space and instructional services is to the military student. However, the inclusion of community people on a space-available and self-paid basis may be beneficial to all parties concerned and is encouraged.

III. The Evaluation of Educational Programs on Military Bases

A. Educational programs conducted by accredited or candidate postsecondary institutions on a military base should be evaluated by the appropriate regional accrediting commission in conjunction with an institutional evaluation.

Although informal evaluations may be made by military education staff, it is not appropriate for the military to engage in formally evaluating the programs of an accredited postsecondary institution. It is recommended, however, that appropriate military educational personnel confer with the institution in doing the relevant part of its self-study. An evaluation team may wish to confer with the military regarding the support, resources, and effectiveness of a given program.

B. If an accredited institution offers educational programs on a military base within another accrediting region, the evaluation should be conducted jointly by the affected commissions with primary responsibility vested in the parent commission. In the case of overseas programs conducted outside the United States or its possessions, the evaluation should be conducted by the appropriate regional commission.

C. Those responsible for postsecondary military base programs will be cognizant of and generally expected to meet the appropriate military, state, regional accrediting commission, and FRACHE guidelines for operation of the programs.

Consortia Arrangements

Where two or more institutions are joined together in consortia to provide educational programs on military bases certain common administrative arrangements and educaitonal policies need to be agreed upon. This can be handled by a consortium board with appropriate representation from each of the participating institutions and the military. Such matters as calendar, admissions, course and degree requirements, transfer of credits, and tuition should be developed.

From the outset the appropriate regional accrediting commission should be notified of and involved in the development of the consortia. Evaluation of the consortia educational program will be in conjunction with the evaluation and accreditation process with each participating institution. Consortia arrangements will not be independently evaluated for separate accredited status.

Approved by the Council
October 24, 1973